TERMS OF ADDRESS IN PALESTINIAN ARABIC

A RESEARCH PAPER (3 CREDIT HOURS)

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE

MASTERS OF ARTS (TESOL &LINGUISTICS)

BY

DUAA ABUAMSHA

DR. CAROLYN MACKAY- ADVISOR

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

MUNCIE, INDIANA

APRIL 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Learning how individuals open conversations or how people address one another in a certain language is an important issue in studying communication and hence establishing social relationships between individuals. These terms of address, defined as words used in a speech event that refer to the addressee of that speech event, can be extremely important conveyors of social information (Parkinson, 1985). This paper investigates address behavior in Palestinian Arabic i.e., the way individual speakers or groups of speakers use the repertory of address variants available to them. The literature which discusses address systems in different languages and cultures points out that the majority of studies on address terms have primarily considered Anglo-American, Euro-Asian and Latin American contexts, yet we are left with relatively very little research, if any, that has investigated settings in an Arabic-speaking community. Also, investigating a community's address system is worth-while since the rules governing address usage in various cultures are often extremely complicated and it is frequently difficult to work out which factors do or do not influence the choice of terms of address (Mehrotra, 1981, p.135; Coulmas, 1979, pp. 242-243). Accordingly, this paper examines the repertoire and range of address terms used by Palestinian speakers in Gaza and investigates the linguistic resources

available to them. The research will not only look for traditional linguistic structure or form but also for the social structure of the terms as a linguistic subsystem and how Palestinian speakers use terms of address to perform specific social and pragmatic functions

The paper's main hypothesis is that social context, intimacy and distance determine the form of address Palestinian speakers in Gaza use. It also examines to what extent the main sociolinguistic assumption in address theory which holds that the address terms used vary according to speaker's and addressee's social characteristics- age, class, education, religion, ideology and relationship- can also apply to an Arabic-speaking community. Braun (1988, p.13) states that from a sociolinguistic point of view, address behavior is meaningful whenever speakers have to choose between several variants; all of which are grammatically correct in a given conversational context. Thus it is assumed that extra-linguistic factors then determine the selection of grammatically interchangeable forms and the variant chosen expresses social features of the dyad. The address system, which comprises the totality of available forms and their interrelations in one language (Braun, 1988, p.12), used by Palestinian speakers in Gaza is examined using data collected in naturally-occurring situations in which persons of different ages, sexes, social class/education/occupation and relationships are involved. The results of the study show that the Gaza address system is no exception to the principle that the address forms used encode the addressee's as well as the speaker's differences of age, sex, social or occupational status, familiarity, relationship and kinship, as well as the formality of the context which all play a part in selecting a certain form. Also the paper shows what social rules, that are peculiar to the Palestinian Arab community, govern address behavior in Palestinian Arabic. The findings of the study also show that address system used in the Gaza speech community reflects the social and cultural values and norms of the community.

1.2 Objectives and Research questions

The main purpose of the present study is to explore the sociolinguistic norms of address in the Palestinian Arabic of Gaza by examining the rules and patterns of address that people employ in their interactions. Accordingly, the study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1- What are the lexical expressions and linguistic forms used by Palestinian speakers of Arabic to address each other?
2- What factors account for the differences in the varied address forms used for an interlocutor among Palestinian speakers in Gaza?
3- To what extent are forms of address in Palestinian Arabic rule-governed? If so, what rules are involved and what factors constrain these rules.

In answering the above questions, it is assumed that the choice of address forms by Palestinian speakers will vary according to formality of context, the relationship between interlocutors and their social characteristics. Accordingly, the present study uses qualitative and quantitative analyses to investigate these hypotheses or assumptions:

***Hypothesis One*:** The relationship "intimacy/distance" between interlocutors "speaker and addressee" influences the choice of forms of address.

***Hypothesis Two**:* The setting and formality of context has an impact on the choice of forms of address.

Hypothesis three: variations in the forms of address are influenced by age, gender, education, occupation, the spoken dialect and other social characteristics of interlocutors, i.e., speaker and addressee.

In the hypotheses stated above and in the documentation sheet that will be explained later and used as instrument to collect data, the person who initiates addressing someone in a conversation is referred to as ***Speaker***, and the person who receives the address term and then uses a term of address to address the speaker in return is referred to as ***Addressee.***

The above hypotheses have been based on the realization by members of any speech community that the use of certain linguistic forms in addressing others is not random but rather governed by some variables such as the relation between the speaker and their addressee, their age, sex and social status, etc. Also the present study chose to investigate the impact of context and relationship between interlocutors on the choice of address forms in light of what previous studies found about the importance of context in the choice of address. For example, Brown and Yule (1989, p. 54) argue that "in different social contexts different terms of address will be used." Also Lyons (1977) points out that the terms of address used by a social inferior to a social superior may be different from those between peers, as in vocative terms like "Sir" or "Doctor" or "My Lord" (in the courtroom). The study assumes that how well we know someone i.e. intimacy/distance, is crucial in determining our linguistic choices. For instance, though Palestinian Arabic does not have a parallel distinction to the French Tu/Vous, the choice of first name to address someone indicates intimacy, whereas the choice of titles and other address forms shows that the addressee is different from the speaker in terms of age, social status, occupational rank, education, etc or that the relationship between them is not intimate enough to use first names reciprocally. As Holmes (1992, p. 247) states, "many factors may contribute in determining the degree of social distance or intimacy between people- relative age, sex, social roles, whether people work together, or are members of the same family and so on."

Investigating the relationship between the extra-linguistic variables of age, sex, education, occupation, spoken dialect and other social characteristics of interlocutors, on the one hand, and variation in the use of forms of address, on the other hand, is also equally significant

and important. Afful (2006b) points out that several sociolinguistic studies on address terms tend to show that address forms are dependent on a number of social factors or variables such as economic status, age, sex, the relationship that exists between interlocutors and the domains of a communicative encounter in addition to issues such as ethnicity and religion which can also be inferred and realized from address terms (2006a).

1.3 Theoretical framework

Parkinson (1985, p.3) notes that naturally different speech communities may make different uses of terms of address as a whole. In this respect, he makes a distinction between communities that use address forms only occasionally as relatively minor conveyors of social information and other communities that use them constantly having them carry a relatively large portion of the social communication load. The address system used by Palestinian speakers in Gaza fits into the latter category. The Palestinian address system has a large number of address terms used frequently by speakers in different contexts and most importantly the use of these address terms is socially rule-governed. Accordingly, in addition to looking into the linguistic structure and the inventory of address terms that is available to Palestinian speakers, the present study also examines the social structure of this address system from a sociolinguistic perspective. The researcher assumes that Palestinian address behavior is governed by social rules and the main question of this study is to examine the meanings of Palestinian address terms in order to see the kind of social rules that are involved and what factors may influence or constrain these rules.

Theoretically, this study makes use of interactional and variationist sociolinguistics to examine address behavior of Palestinian speakers in various communicative encounters or interactions. From an interactional perspective, the present study uses qualitative and quantitative analyses to describe and explain how interactants draw on the linguistic resources available to them and select appropriate variants or forms to address their interlocutors in a socio-cultural

setting and convey social meanings and at the same time reflect the kind of relationship they have with the addressee whether that of power and distance or solidarity and intimacy. The analysis will show how interlocutors utilize different linguistic variants of address terms to demonstrate and create solidarity, for example, or to ensure that distance between them and the other person is maintained.

Moreover, this study draws on the variationist approach in sociolinguistics according to which the language varies not only according to the social characteristics of language users but also according to the social context in which the speaker finds himself (Keshavarz, 2001, p.6). With respect to variation in speakers' social background, the study assumes that men and women give and receive address forms differently; people of different age groups will address their interlocutors and be addressed by them differently and that interlocutors' other social characteristics of education, occupation, regional dialect as well as the relationship between interlocutors have an impact on the variation in address forms used.

This study will be looking into variation of address forms not only according to speakers' social characteristics but also variation according to context. Examining the impact of context on the choice of address forms becomes essentially crucial in light of what Holmes (1992) notes that speakers use different styles in different social contexts. Holmes (1992, p.1) asserts "examining the way people use language in different social contexts provides a wealth of information about the way language works, as well as about the social relationships in a community." Keshavarz (2001) also states that it is important to investigate the role of context in language since "the linguistic and social behavior not only has to be appropriate to the individual and his socio-economic background, but it also needs to be suitable for particular occasions and situations" (p.5).

In addition, Levinson (1983, p.54) asserts that "the single most obvious way in which the relationship between language and context is reflected in the structure of languages themselves is

through the phenomenon of *deixis."* Among the forms of deixis, one that is directly related to this study is *social deixis*, which refers to social roles played by an individual in a speech event. Social deixis includes terms of address and honorifics (Keshavarz, 2001).

1.4 Significance of the research

Keshavarz (2001, p.6) notes that address forms have been of great interest to sociolinguistics, anthropologists, and social psychologists because these forms can evidently manifest the relationship between language and society. He points out that the value of studying address terms comes from the fact that the pronouns and nominal forms of address provide one of the best places to look for a correspondence between language and society in the grammar of a language (Keshavarz, 2001).

Also studying address terms in different contexts is worthwhile for "different speech communities are likely to be different, since different languages have different linguistic resources to express what is culturally permissible and meaningful" (Affulb, p. 276). Following from this caveat, it is worth investigating the address terms in a middle-eastern speech community in Gaza with cultural and different background that is different from Anglo-American, East Asian, Latin American and African contexts, as a way of contributing to the ever-increasing volume of literature or scholarship on sociolinguistic studies of address terms from various speech communities worldwide. Furthermore, investigating any community's address system is significant since the rules governing address usage in one culture cannot be generalized to another regardless of how similar the two communities may be. This investigation of a culture's address usage is particularly important due to the fact that rules governing address usage in various cultures are often extremely complicated and it is frequently difficult to work out which factors do or do not influence the choice of addresses (Mehrotra 1981, p. 135; Coulmas 1979, pp.242-3).

In addition, Palestinian Arabic is not the first language about which this type of question has been asked. Dickey (1996) indicates that address usage has often mattered a great deal to ordinary people, and our own times are no exception. Dickey reported that in 1977 a German woman who addressed a policeman as *du* rather than *Sie* was fined 2,250 DM for this improper address, and in 1983 a German bus driver was fined 100 DM for saying *du* to a Turkish student (Kretzenbacher and Segebrecht 1991, p.31, both cited in Dickey 1996, p.2).

According to Dickey (1996), the last thirty years or so have seen the evolution of a new form of research on address usage, aiming at the scientific study of address forms in a wide variety of languages and the discovery of underlying rules governing address usage (see for example, Brown and Gilman 1960; Brown and Ford 1961; Chandrasekhar 1970; Cintra 1972; Bates and Benigni 1975; Paulston 1976; Ostor 1982; Parkinson 1985; Philipsen and Huspeck 1985; Braun 1988; Muhlhausler and Harre 1990; Oyetade 1995; Martiny 1996, Keshavarz 2001, Afful 2006a, b).

However, of the literature which does discuss address systems in different languages and cultures, the majority of the above linguistic and socio-linguistic studies of forms of address and many other studies have been mainly concerned with Anglo-American, Euro-Asian, African and Latin American contexts, yet we are left with relatively very little research, if any, that has considered settings in an Arabic-speaking community. Of the few studies that considered address in Arabic-speaking settings are the studies done by Yasin (1977a, 1977b, 1978) on term of address usage in Kuwaiti Arabic, the short study done by Mitchell (1975) on address terms usage in a small Jordanian village, in addition to the sociolinguistic study done by Parkinson (1985) on address system in Egyptian Arabic where he and his fieldworkers gathered naturally-occurring data for more than one year in different parts of Cairo. To the researcher's knowledge, no study of terms of address in Palestinian Arabic has been done. So it would be significant to see how the different concepts of address theory e.g., axes of power and solidarity, reciprocity vs. non-

reciprocity, symmetry and asymmetry as introduced by Brown and Gilman (1960) and other concepts introduced in address theory to consider American and European contexts can be applied to a different culture such as the Palestinian community and to what extent the Palestinian address system can comply with universal tendencies in address theory.

This need for investigating address terms in more languages with different cultural and social contexts is particularly significant in light of what Hwang (1991**)** noted that the review of some of the literature on terms of address shows that whereas many researchers reported that universal semantics of power and solidarity, as introduced by Brown and Gilman (1960), are at work in numerous languages and cultures, "thorough research on more languages needs to be carried on in order to support, modify, or reject Brown's proposals" (p.119). This need becomes more crucial in light of what Braun (1988) found, having dealt with terms of address in numerous languages and cultures, that "one must be content with widespread tendencies instead of universal rules" (p.36). Braun concluded that "universals in the field of address may be very few and those which can be found will probably be of a rather trivial nature" (p.304).

Moreover, the literature shows that forms of address in diverse languages have been studied from a variationist point of view; however, many of these studies have mainly focused on variation in the forms of address according to the social characteristics of the language users and the relationship between interlocutors. For example, Dickey (1996, p.7) notes that the importance of context (setting, audience, and topic of discourse) in determining address usage is less universally recognized by linguists than that of speaker-addressee relationship, partly because surveys conducted by means of questionnaires or interviews often overlook this factor.

The significance of the present study, however, lies in the fact that in addition to investigating the role of interlocutors' social characteristics in the usage of address terms, it will also be concerned with the role of social context in the choice of forms of address. In this study,

two important variables, social context and degree of formality of social context, are dealt with in addition to interlocutors' characteristics. In Arab culture, for example, forms of address used by friends and family members may vary according to the formality of the social context, that is, couples may use intimate or endearment forms to address each other in private while they may shift to more polite forms in a formal context. Therefore, it is important in this study to test the hypothesis that one's use of forms of address is influenced by social context.

Moreover, a number of recent studies have reported that although in certain dyads, contextual factors may never be strong enough to outweigh speaker-addressee relationship and characteristics in determining address usage, their influence can be crucial (Kridalaksana, 1974, pp.19-20; Freidrich 1966, p. 229; Howell 1968, p. 554; Southworth 1974, p. 183; Jaworski 1982, p.262; Holmes 1992, p.297). Furthermore, the investigation of the role of context in the choice of address forms in this study is essential by the fact that some settings require certain forms of address. For example, Holmes (1992: 297) points out "If he [your brother] is acting as the judge in a law court then calling him *Tom* will be considered disrespectful, while at the dinner table calling him *Your honor* will be perceived as equally rude."

In short, the current study is viewed to be significant to the field of sociolinguistics because it will contribute to the insightful study of the relationship between language, society and social characteristics of language users, on the one hand, and language and context, on the other hand. It will show how different speakers use language differently in different social contexts to address each other, an important function to start with in any interaction to establish an appropriate context for the conversation to continue.

1.5 Palestinian Arabic

Palestinian Arabic is a Levantine Arabic dialect subgroup[1]. It is to be noted, however, that the term 'Palestinian Arabic' is not a uniform or conclusive term that refers to one single variety spoken throughout the country. Similar to other Arabic dialects, Palestinian Arabic makes a distinction between the standard and the vernacular or colloquial varieties. The Standard dialect is the official literary written form and is sometimes spoken in official settings such as meetings and interviews. The Standard maintains a high degree of uniformity and functions as the official standard language that is the medium of instruction at school and is understood by all Palestinian as well as other Arabic speakers. It is the language of the vast majority of written material such as books, newspapers, magazines, political lectures, official correspondence and literature and of formal speaking situations such as sermons, lectures, news broadcasts and speeches.

Moreover, the colloquial or spoken Arabic does not refer to one single spoken variety. Rather the spoken form includes a number of local dialects which, despite their being mutually comprehensible, exhibit different linguistic features that make them distinguishable. For example, in Gaza, the research site of the present study, the spoken varieties of spoken Palestinian Arabic mainly include urban and rural vernaculars in addition to the Bedouin dialect which is spoken by a few speakers of Bedouin origins. This distinction among spoken varieties is important for this study which assumes that the speaker's and addressee's characteristics influence the linguistic forms and social rules of the address terms used. More specifically, the study assumes that speakers of the urban dialect in Gaza will show difference in address behavior from speakers of the rural dialect. Also it is relevant to mention here that the Standard form of Arabic spoken in

[1] In my transcription I have used the following symbols for Arabic sounds that do not exist in English: *ʔ* voiceless glottal stop, *ʕ* voiced pharyngeal fricative, *ħ* voiceless pharyngeal fricative, *q* voiceless uvular plosive, *x* voiceless dorso-velar fricative, $s^{ʕ}$ voiceless emphatic alveolar fricative, $d̪^{ʕ}$ voiced emphatic denti-alveolar plosive.

formal settings sometimes is also expected to correlate with forms used to address participants involved.

Generally speaking, one of the main phonological features that distinguish the Palestinian main spoken dialects in different regions of the country is the pronunciation of the standard voiceless uvular plosive [q] or 'qaaf.' Rural Palestinian speakers in the countryside are generally distinguished by pronouncing *qaaf* 'q' as a voiceless velar kaf /k/ which distinguish them from other Arabic varieties. Palestinian speakers of urban dialects in most cities, on the other hand, render the 'qaaf' as a glottal stop /ʔ/ which is much more similar to the northern Levantine dialects of Syria and Lebanon. Also the [qaaf] becomes the voiced velar /g/ when rendered by rural or Bedouin speakers in the far South of Palestinian territories including the Gaza Strip.

In the *Gaza Strip*, the research site of the present study, the uvular voiceless plosive [q] becomes a glottal stop /ʔ/ when pronounced by urban speakers in the city of Gaza. These speakers who live in the city are usually of an urban origin; however, other speakers may be of a rural origin and just moved to live in the city and adopted its dialect. Other Palestinian speakers may be of an urban origin and yet they live in countryside or one of the refugee camps in the different parts of Gaza and they still retain their urban dialect. When the data were collected, the focus was on the spoken dialect as a rural or urban. Speakers of the rural dialect in Gaza, on the other hand, are distinguished among many other features by the pronunciation of [*qaf]* as /g/**.**

1.6 Research Site

The Gaza Strip is the southern part of Palestinian territories. It is a narrow piece of land along the Mediterranean coast between Israel and Egypt. It is just 40km long and 10km wide with an area of only 360 square kilometers. The Gaza Strip is home to more than 1.5 million Palestinians and the majority of its population is refugees who represent over three-quarters of the current estimated population. An area roughly twice the size of Lichtenstein, with about 40 times

the population, Gaza is one of the most densely populated places on the planet (http://www.un.org/unrwa/publications/Gaza.html). According to UNRWA figures, the total number of Palestinian refugees in Gaza is 1,073,303 with 495,006 of them living in eight refugee camps in different parts of the Gaza Strip from its north to south.

For the purpose of this study, the local dialects spoken by Palestinian speakers in Gaza, which are assumed to be influencing the choice of address terms, are divided into urban or rural dialects which are distinguishable by the features indicated above. To guarantee access to data from both urban and rural speakers, fieldworkers were distributed equally in the city of Gaza and rural areas of Gaza. This would be important especially for the purpose of collecting data in family and social gatherings since the two groups of speakers tend to live in different parts of Gaza. However, at work and campus settings, the fieldworkers had access to both types of speakers since most people go to work or universities in Gaza city where all principal work stations, banks, hospitals and organizations are located in addition to the four universities which are located in the city of Gaza.

SECTION TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section contains a review of literature of some of the most significant theoretical and empirical studies on *address terms*. It begins with giving some definitions of address terms and the forms they may take as presented by different linguists followed by an explanation of the social meaning and function of address terms. Research on address theory and various empirical studies that examined address terms in different languages and cultures are also discussed in more detail.

2.2 **Linguistic Definition and Forms of '*Address Terms*'**

Since 'address' is the basic concept in address theory, it is relevant here to start with the definition or linguistic meaning of terms of address and their social function as a preliminary step in the delineation of the subject being investigated. Dickey (1996) states that there is no question among linguists as to the definition of 'address.' For example, Braun (1988, p.7) explains that the term 'address' refers to a speaker's linguistic reference to his/her interlocutors.

Braun (1988, p.7) explains that forms of address may serve as a means of initiating contact, but frequently other forms are used, e.g., in English "*Hey!, Excuse me*," German "*Sag mal,"* French "*Pardon!"* All this, as well as verbal and non-verbal greeting, are excluded from the definition of address. Forms of address to be investigated in this study comprise words and phrases used for addressing and refer to the interlocutor and thus contain a strong element of

deixis. Braun (1988) indicates that often address terms designate the interlocutors, but not necessarily so, since their literal lexical meaning can differ from or even contradict the addressee's characteristics (p.7). For instance, in Arabic-speaking communities a girl may address her friend's mother as 'aunt' to show respect to her though there is no blood relation between them.

Moreover, in the present study, it is important to note that nominal 'terms of address' are distinguished from 'reference terms.' This differentiation is crucial in light of Afful's (2006b) claim that although the same linguistic form may be used for both address terms and reference terms to designate a person in a communicative encounter, there is evidence that this is not always the case (Paredes- Lorente, 2002, cited in Afful 2006b). Also Braun (1988, p.11) indicates that rules of address and rules of reference may differ for kinship terms and other nominal forms of address. For example, the English 'grandson, niece and nephew' and their Arabic counterparts are a common form of reference, but will hardly be used as a form of address. Instead, the usual nominal variant for addressing a grandson, a niece or a nephew would be their first name.

Therefore, throughout this study, I use Afful's (2006b) definition of address terms to refer to the linguistic expression by which a speaker designates an addressee in a face-to-face encounter. I also draw upon Oyetade's (1995) definition of address terms as words or expressions used in interactive, dyadic and face-to-face situations to designate the person being talked to while talk is in progress. I also follow Keshavarz's (2001, p.6) definition that terms of address are "linguistic forms that are used in addressing others to attract their attention or for referring to them in the course of a conversation."

In addition, Dickey (1996, p.5) explains that defining address as a speaker's linguistic reference to his/ her interlocutors includes not only nouns as in (*Mary*, how are you? Would *Your Majesty* care to read this letter?) but also pronouns (could *you* close the window?) and second-person verb endings in inflected languages. It does not include words used to get the addressee's

attention but not actually referring to him or her, such as 'hey' or 'excuse me'. In most languages forms of address comprise three word classes: (1) pronouns (2) nouns (3) inflected verbs, supplemented by words which are syntactically dependent on them.

However, defining 'address' as a speaker's linguistic reference to his/her interlocutor(s) is clearly a very broad one and needs further division. According to Dickey (1996, p.5), an obvious linguistic classification of address terms is one by parts of speech, into nouns, pronouns, and verbs, but this division is usually rejected by linguists on the grounds that it obscures the most fundamental distinctions among addressees (Braun 1988, p.303; Kielkiewicz-Janowiak 1992, p.18).

Instead, Dickey (1996) indicates that address forms are classified into syntactically 'bound' and 'free' forms (Braun 1988:11-12; Kielkiewicz-Janowiak 1992: 20). According to Braun (1988), bound morphemes are those integrated into the syntax of a sentence, and free forms are those not so integrated. Thus in the request 'Sara, could you please open the door?" 'Sara' is a free form and 'you' a bound form. Though in English, as in most European languages, free forms tend to be nouns and bound forms are usually pronouns or verbs, in the sentence, 'You! Open the window!' the pronoun 'you' is a free form of address as it is not integrated in the syntax of a sentence.

Furthermore, according to Braun (1988, p.7), *Pronouns of address* are pronouns referring to the interlocutor (s). These are, above all, second person pronouns such as English *you*, German *du* and *ihr*, French *tu* and *vous* and the colloquial Arabic *ʔinta* and *ʔinti*.

On the other hand, Braun (1988) defines nouns of address or nominal terms of address as substantives and adjectives which designate interlocutors or refer to them in some other way. This class comprises the most diverse types. According to Braun's categorization (1988: 9), the most frequent nouns of address include the following types:

(1) Names belong to the nominal repertory of address in all kinds of languages. Numerous classes of names can be distinguished according to the different naming systems and they may have different functions in address. In Palestinian Arabic, for example, personal nouns and nicknames, but not a family name, for example, can be used as address forms, each with particular functions to fulfill.

(2) Kinship terms (KT) are terms for blood relations and for affines. When a KT is extended for addressing someone who is not related to the speaker in one way or other, this is called a fictive use of a KT. Fictive use can also imply addressing a relative with a term expressing a relationship different from the biological one.

(3) In many languages there are forms of address which correspond to English Mr./Mrs. German Herr/Frau, Polish Pan/Pani, etc. Braun (1988) notes that these are general forms which need not be regarded as particular titles and are in common use and though this characterization is vague, a more detailed description of this group of forms would involve language-specific properties. Variants of the Mr./Mrs. type, however, may have different properties in different languages: they can be prefixed or suffixed to names, terms of occupation, etc., or they can stand alone. In Arabic, for example, the equivalent for the English Mr./Mrs. are words that stand by themselves "*al sayed* (Mr.), *al-sayeda* (Mrs.), *al 'anessa* (Miss), *al-Saada* (Messers). Braun (1988) asserts that it is usual to have this category of Mr./Mrs. forms because these variants often have to be distinguished from what we call titles since they may have different formal, combinatory, or social characteristics.

(4) Titles: According to Braun (1988), there is no agreement as to what should be classified as a 'title'. Frequently, especially in English, the term title is used without distinction for all nominal variants except names. However, there is a preference to use titles to refer only to those forms which are bestowed, achieved by appointment (such as doctor,

major), or are inherited (such as Count, Duke). Yet, it is sometimes difficult to mark them off against abstract nouns and occupational terms (Braun, 1988).

(5) Abstract nouns are forms of address which originally referred to some abstract quality of the addressee, e.g., (*Your) Excellency, (your) Grace, (Your) Honor.*

(6) Occupational terms which designate an addressee's profession or function may serve as forms of address, e.g., English *waiter*, French *chauffeur*, Russian v*oditel* 'driver', Arabic *ʔustaaz* 'professor.' They are sometimes combined with other nominal variants depending on the rules of the respective address system.

(7) Words for certain types of relationship are used as forms of address in many languages, e.g., the Arabic *jaar-ii* ' my neighbor,' Turkish *arkadas 'friend', German* Kollege 'colleague'. However, Braun (1988) notes that the relationship expressed in the term need not correspond to the actual relationship. Sometimes such terms are common even among strangers.

(8) Terms of endearment are defined by context and function rather than formal or semantic characteristics. Forms of endearment are, to a certain extent, conventionalized, but linguistic creativity and individual imagination play an important part here (Braun, 1988).

(9) Teknonyms are some forms of address which define addressees as father, brother, wife or daughter of someone else by expressing the addressee's relation to another person. Such forms exist in Arabic, e.g., 'Abu Hassan" (father of Hassan), *bint Mohammed '*daughter of Mohammed.' They often serve as a means of avoiding the addressee's personal name.

2.3 Social Meanings and Function of Address Terms

A part from the terms of address linguistic definition, the forms they may take and the reference each address term may carry, it is not less important here to shed light on the social function and meaning of address forms. As Murphy (1988) has elegantly put it, address forms are

socially driven phenomena. This characteristic of address forms is conspicuously evident in light of the observation that linguistic forms that are used to address others can mirror the complex social relations of individuals in a speech community (Paulston 1976; Trudgill 1983; Chaika 1982).

Moreover, all meanings of forms of address refer to the fact that these forms have their roots in the socio-cultural context of the community where they are used. Leech (1999) considers terms of address "an important formulaic verbal behavior well recognized in the sociolinguistic literature as they signal transactional, interpersonal and deictic ramifications in human relationships" (cited in Afful, 2006b). Moreover, according to Afful (2006a), terms of address are an important part of verbal behavior through which "the behavior, norms and practices of a society can be identified."

Furthermore, Parkinson (1985, p.1) states that terms of address which can be loosely defined as "words used in a speech event that refer to the addressee of that speech" can function as very important conveyors of social information. He indicates that communication in any speech event takes place on several levels simultaneously, and that the form of an utterance and the way it is said encode not only a referential meaning, but also "encode much information about who the speaker believes he is, who he believes the addressee is, what he thinks their relationship is, and what he thinks he is doing by saying what he is saying" (p. 3). He adds that terms of address often play a little or no role in the basic grammatical structures of sentences adding little to the referential meaning of utterances, but they are often crucial in accurately conveying the other social kinds of information. Parkinson made a clear connection between the pragmatics of language use and terms of address by pointing out that studies in the pragmatics of language use have found out that defining and maintaining relationships is one of the most important functions of speech and since terms of address deal directly with these two functions, it is expected that the

structure of a term of address system will be closely related to social variables defining speaker, addressee and their relationship to each other (Parkinson, 1985, p.3).

Morford (1997) suggests that the study of address terms is beneficial for sociolinguistics because it reflects how interpersonal relationships can be socially and strategically constructed. Keshavars (2001) also tackled the same notion that forms can reflect and mirror not only the complex social relations of individuals in a speech community but also the relationship between language and society.

2.4 Review of Research on *Address Terms*

The sociolinguistic study of forms of address is generally agreed upon to have begun with the pioneering classic study of Brown & Gilman (1960). This study discussed the usage of the 2nd person pronouns *tu* and *vous* in French, *du* and *Sie* in German, and the equivalent familiar and formal second-person pronouns (called 'T pronouns' and 'V pronouns' from the Latin *tu* and vos) in other European languages including Italian and Spanish. The authors observed that one form was used to both intimates and to inferiors, while another was used both to non-intimates and to superiors. Brown and Gilman (1960:254-61) maintained that the choice of pronouns was governed by and closely associated with the two social dimensions or axes of power and solidarity in the relationship between speaker and addressee. According to Brown & Gilman, the dimension of power refers to authority or the superiority of one person over another. In this case, the person who has power or superiority over the other uses *Tu*, and receives the deferential *Vous* from the addressee who has no power or in an inferior position to the speaker. The axis of solidarity, by contrast, is reciprocal as it is invoked between equals, peers or people who are close to have a relationship of intimacy. In the solidarity/intimacy axis, the same pronoun *Tu* will be reciprocally used by interlocutors.

Brown and Gilman (1960) have also suggested that change in pronoun usage and the patterns of address over time depended on special circumstances that differ from a speech community to another. They also suggest that the modern direction of change in pronoun usage expresses a will to extend the solidary ethic to everyone.

These important observations about power and solidarity dimensions as postulated by Brown & Gilman in relation to address behavior have also been shown to exist in the American system of address where a person can be addressed by first name (FN) or title and last name (TLN). Brown and Ford (1961) showed that the distinction in American English between address by first name ('John') or by title and last name ('Mr. Smith') functioned in the same way as the distinction between T pronouns and V pronouns (called a 'T/V distinction') in European languages. They also found that address usage 'is not predictable from properties of the addressee alone and not predictable from properties of the speaker alone but only from properties of the dyad' (Brown and Ford 1961, p.375). Examining a wide variety of data from various sources, Brown & Ford found that three major patterns emerged in the analysis: mutual exchange of FN, mutual TLN, and non-reciprocal use of FN where a person addresses another by FN, and gets TLN in return. Brown and Ford accounted for the choice of either one of these three patterns by being governed by social factors such as acquaintance, intimacy, age, and occupational status. The analysis in this study revealed that Americans address people with whom they are casually acquainted by mutual TLN; but as soon as they are used to each other, a change is made to reciprocal first name. The study has also shown that the non-reciprocal pattern is governed by two kinds of relations, namely difference in age and in occupational status, with the latter outranking the former. In addition to these three major patterns of address, other variants exist in American system of address like: title without name, last name alone, and multiple names; the use of each of these patterns correlates with a certain level of intimacy between the speaker and the addressee.

Following from these two earlier works by Brown & Gilman (1960), and Brown & Ford (1961), a number of other relatively early studies on address forms in other societies have emerged, with broader scope and depth contributing to the development of address theory. Among these studies is an article by Susan Ervin-Tripp (1972) which explained American English forms of address by means of flow charts; a study of pronominal address in Italian by Bates and Benigni (1975), and a study of children's pronominal address system in French and Spanish by Lambert and Tucker (1976). Among other studies, Hymes (1967) studied social distance, Pride (1971) approached formality and informality and Moles (1974) investigated the role of confidence and respect in address terms choice.

Moreover, Dickey (1996, p.3) also reports a number of more recent works that have devoted immense amounts of time and energy to exhaustive surveys of the usage of address terms and are worth mentioning for their detail and length. These include books by Agnieszka Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992) on Polish and English, Sylvia Basoglu (1978) on Turkish, Dilworth Parkinson (1985) on Egyptian Arabic, and Susan Bean (1978) on Kannada, as well as a dissertation on Korean by Juck-Ryoon Hwang (1975). Dickey adds that perhaps the best work on address behavior in recent years has come from a project at Kiel University which has produced the most comprehensive bibliography on the subject (Braun, Kohz, and Schubert 1986) and by far the most comprehensive overview of address theory (Braun 1988). Dickey adds that the project has also produced numerous works on address in individual languages, most of which are clear and accurate (p.4).

However, it is to be noted that though subsequent research has followed the early studies of Brown & Gilman (1960), Brown & Ford (1961), etc and has come up with findings which have not radically deviated from these earlier studies, some of this research has criticized the power and solidarity axes for being deterministic in supposing a pre-existing cultural system from which verbal practices are built (Kendall, 1981; Kramer, 1975; Muhlhausler & Harre, 1990,

Braun, 1988). These studies found that the address rules or regularities suggested by Brown/Gilman and Brown/Ford are not general or comprehensive enough to serve as universal guidelines in analyzing address behavior in all kinds of languages and societies especially because address systems are hardly homogeneous. For example, Fasold (1990, p.25) notes that the definition of solidarity dimension and the level of solidarity required for reciprocal address varies substantially from one society to another, and from one individual to another. In this regard, Braun (1988) has also noted that of the languages examined in Kiel University Project (1980), no language exhibited sufficient homogeneity as to be satisfactorily described in terms of what Brown/Gilman, Brown/Ford, and Ervin-Tripp found. Braun (1988) concluded that there are hardly any universal rules in address theory, and rather "one must be content with widespread tendencies instead of universal rules" (p.36). In addition, it has been observed that in using address forms, speakers apply their own personal meaning, thus often differing from the conventional interpretation (Braun 1988, Sequeira, 1993).

Furthermore, of the research that investigated address behavior, some studies have suggested that speakers use address terms to negotiate or transform a cultural system (see Fitch, 1991; Morford, 1997). Similarly, in China the title *tongzhi*, or comrade, indicates how a title reflects China's changing social structure (Fang & Heng, 1993; Scotton & Zhu, 1983). Also, Afful (2006b, p.277) notes that sociolinguistic studies on address terms have provided further insights into various facts of human communication. For instance, it is known that speakers use terms of address in creative and nonliteral ways such as metaphor, joking, irony and deception (Fitch, 1991). Afful (2006b) also notes that the vitality of address terms is also acknowledged as they pervade key social institutions such as politics (Jaworski & Galasinski, 2000), religion (Dzameshie, 1997; Squeira, 1993), the media (Edu-Buandoh, 1999) and academia (Afful, 1998; Dickey, 1997). In this regard, Hudson (1980) points out that an important dimension of variation

in address terms has to do with cultural patterns that hold for some particular population in general due to their social values, beliefs and customs.

As mentioned earlier, though research in address theory started with American and European contexts, subsequent studies on address terms focused on other languages in Asian and African contexts among others and supported the view that address forms identify and construct cultural beliefs in addition to their being governed by the community's social rules (Evans-Pritchard 1964; Mehrotra 1981; Parkinson 1985; Koul 1995; Oyetade 1995; Keshavarz 2001; Manjulakshi 2004; Afful 2006a, b, etc.)

For example, Mehrotra (1981) describes the non-kin forms of address in Hindi in relation to socio-cultural setting of the dyads using them. He notes that variation in the usage of address terms is a tool or a means of reflecting interlocutors' social background or characteristics as they define and affirm both identity and status of the speaker and addressee. He further asserts that address forms embody a crucial stage in face-to-face interaction and represent a special aspect of relational language due to the fact that "they serve not merely as a bridge between the individuals but also as a kind of 'emotional capital'; which can be invested and manipulated in order to achieve a specific result." He concludes that an examination of address forms and their linguistic and socio-linguistic dimensions reflects a great deal of information about the social structure of the dyad.

Furthermore, as one of the few studies that investigated address behavior in Arabic-speaking settings, Parkinson (1985) conducted a study about terms of address in EA where he gathered naturally occurring data for more than one year from different speech events in different settings in Cairo. This information was gathered by the study team, which was composed of the researcher and his Egyptian assistants, from a wide variety of situations with all possible combinations of speakers and addressees in terms of sex, age, social class, and other variables. What is interesting about this study is that at the end of the year in Cairo, after gathering all the

data together and transcribing it onto cards, the research team found that they amassed over five thousand instances of EA term of address usage, representing a large number of situation types and terms which is a significant evidence of how address terms are integral and indispensible component of the EA social system and structure. These data involve lots of examples of speakers and addressees of all ages, sexes, and social classes, and from several parts of the town.

This study is significant because it is of the very few studies that examined address in an Arabic-speaking community and because it did not only look for traditional "linguistic structure or form", but also described the EA term of address system from a sociolinguistic point of view as it also looked for the social structure of the terms as a linguistic subsystem. It focused on how the speaker using these terms of address would be able to function effectively in a whole communicative situation rather than merely the ability to produce grammatical sentences (Parkinson, 1985, p.3). Interestingly, the two axes of "solidarity and power" that Brown and Gilman (1960) postulated in their study proved to be strongly present in the structure and usage of many address terms in EA.

Exploring personal names in Kashmiri, Koul (1995) points out that a study of terms of address in any language is significant to the socio-linguistic research. He further indicates that these terms are determined by certain factors as social structure, cultural pattern and geographical setting. He elaborates that usage and selection of modes of address are determined by socio-economic status, literacy level, caste, age and sex in addition to their being influenced by different historical and social factors as well.

Due to the fact that African languages have not been studied systematically and because they were reported in the literature of address behavior research less than European languages, Oyetade (1995) is one of the early efforts that studied address behavior in an African context that intended to provide a springboard for similar studies on other African languages. Oyetade (1995) provided a descriptive analysis of the entire system of address forms in Yoruba, a Defoid

language of the Niger-Congo phylum, spoken primarily in the western part of Nigeria. Examining data from short radio and TV plays, unobtrusive observation of actual usage, and introspection, Oyetade revealed the choices made by interlocutors are guided by the perceived social relationship that exists between them. He also discovered that the principal indices of this among the Yoruba are age, social status, and kinship. Oyetda also noticed some certain peculiarities. For example, the dichotomy of power vs. solidarity postulated by Brown & Gilman (1960) becomes blurred with respect to Yoruba kinship terms of address; thus he concluded that solidarity does not imply equality among the Yoruba.

Also to fill in the gap of paucity of materials of address terms in African languages, Afful (2006b) conducted a socio-linguistic study of non-kinship address terms among the Akans of postcolonial Ghana, bringing to the literature of address behavior a little-studied speech community, the Fantes of Ghana. Using observation as the main research tool combined with interview and introspection, the researcher noted nine principal terms of address. In his analysis, Afful also found that the influence of Westernism and modernism was reflected in the use of personal names and catch phrases. Afful also noticed that with differing levels of frequency and saliency, the use of these address terms among the Akans was dictated by socio-cultural factors such as gender, status, age and relationship of interactants as well as pragmatic factors. Afful (2006b) asserts that his study and earlier studies in African communities have confirmed the socio-cultural situatedness of address terms in these communities similar to the findings of sociolinguistic studies on address terms in non-African settings.

Also, as a contribution to the literature of research on address forms done in non-Western contexts, Kashavarz (2001) studied the choice of forms of address in Tahran, Persia. The significance of this study lies in the fact that it deals primarily with the role of social context as well as intimacy and distance in the choice of address forms; a factor that received less attention in the literature of address terms research than the variation in the forms of address according to

the social characteristics of the language users and the relationship between interlocutors. The study also examined variation in the use of address forms according to the interlocutors' social characteristics of age, sex, and social class. The results of the data analysis indicate that the use of intimate forms of address is inversely proportional to social distance and the formality of context. Kashavarz noted that as "social distance and degree of formality of context increase, the frequency of familiar terms decreases." The results also indicate that in informal familial situations, age is more significant than sex and social class in determining forms of address. However, the data analysis also showed that under formal circumstances, sex is a stronger determiner in the use of address forms.

Moreover, in a study of bilingual creativity in Chinese English, Zhang (2002) emphasizes the importance of examining address terms particularly as these terms play an important role in conveying cultural messages, especially with respect to the status of interlocutors and power relation between them.

Finally, Manjulakshi (2004) investigated modes of address in Kannada in a sociolinguistic study of language use in Mysore District. Manjulakshi states that terms and modes of address are important in any society for purposes of identification and expression of ideas. To her, the use of these terms depends upon the social rank, age, and the sex of the persons involved in any communicative situation. She also indicates that the selection and usage of address terms is guided by the relationship that exists or is perceived to exist between speakers and addressees.

The above literary review not only synthesizes the research on address theory and terms in general but also provides the context for this research. In line with those previous studies on address terms, the primary goal of the present study is to contribute to the increasing scholarship on address terms worldwide by exploring the range of address terms among Palestinian speakers in Gaza and providing a descriptive analysis of the entire system of address forms in Gaza.

To accomplish this goal, I describe the data collection method and procedure in section three. Section four discusses and analyzes the findings of the study. The analysis focuses on how the address forms used by speakers in Gaza support the hypotheses of the present study. The analysis focus is on showing how the choices of address forms made by interlocutors are guided by the perceived relationship that exists between them, the context or setting and the interlocutors' social characteristics of age, gender, occupational rank, education and other factors.

3. SECTION THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section presents and explains the research methodology used to answer the study questions and test the hypotheses that: 1) the relationship "intimacy/distance" between interlocutors influences the choice of forms of address 2) variations in the forms of address are influenced by age, gender, education, occupation, the spoken dialect and other social characteristics of speaker and addressee and 3) the setting and formality of context have an impact on the choice of forms of address. This section begins with a description of the data collection method and rationale for its use in this research. A detailed discussion of the worksheet to be used for documenting data, the choice of fieldworkers and the training process is also presented. Finally, the procedure to be used in collecting data for the present study using a code sheet is examined and discussed.

3.2 Data-Collection Method

To investigate the address system in Palestinian Arabic, naturally-occurring forms of address were collected by 8 male and female fieldworkers in the research site of Gaza. The fieldworkers were trained on how to use an observation technique whereby they could take notes of forms of address that occurred around them in various contexts of interaction and communication with or without their participation.

Using a documentation worksheet, the fieldworkers recorded the exact terms of address i.e. nouns or pronouns they overheard in natural contexts in addition to the context, setting, topic of conversation in which the address form occurred as well as relationship between interlocutors. The documentation sheet also included a section where fieldworkers wrote down the gender, age, appearance, occupation, education, dialect and neighborhood of *the speaker;* the term used in this study to refer to the person who initiated using a term of address in a conversation. The sheet also included a section where the fieldworker wrote down social characteristics of *the addressee*; the term used here to refer to the person who received the term of address and addressed the speaker in return using an appropriate reciprocal or non-reciprocal term of address. The researcher and fieldworkers also used the documentation sheet to record different examples of address forms from TV shows and radio programs. These data from T.V would be especially significant for very formal situations that involve interviews and conversations with important political, intellectual and social figures. Such situations may not be easily available for the fieldworkers to observe in daily life.

3.3 Rationale for using natural observation method

According to Braun (1988, p.310), aims and objectives of the study, available time and material means of an investigation determine the most suitable methodological approach for the collection of data. The type of data collection method used usually depends on the goal of the study or the resources of the researcher. In this section of the study methodology, I explain why I chose to use participant observation to collect data for investigating the address system in Gaza.

Since the purpose of this study is to examine how speakers of different ages, sexes and other social characteristics address each other in different contexts, I believe that naturally occurring data have the advantage of reflecting the actual use of language and not just how people think they are using the language. In other words, since informants' statements about their

language behavior are not necessarily identical with their actual behavior and do not necessarily reflect subconscious use of the language, collecting naturally-occurring data for this study is expected to eliminate what Braun (1988) called the possible discrepancy of reported behavior and actual behavior.

In addition, Labov (1972) has shown that self-reported usage of language often does not match real usage, so he called for collecting data using participant observation in sociolinguistic research. Labov (1972a, b) indicates that data should be obtained from everyday speech in natural settings since only unconscious speech represents accurate interactional norms. Labov has emphasized that authentic data come from observing people use language while they are not aware of being watched**.** In a research on the historical present tense, Wolfson (1976) has called for the development of creative techniques for the gathering of naturally occurring speech samples. She found that neither interviews nor tape-recorded group sessions proved neutral or adequate, rather an explanation is found in the notion of a speech event, so she advocated simple techniques of participation. Wolfson even goes further by saying that "ethnographic research is the only reliable method about the way speech acts function in interaction" (1983, p.95).

Although several studies on terms of address usage used different data collection methods such as interviews and questionnaires (Braun 1988, Keshavarz 2001), other studies employed naturally occurring data collected in everyday interactive situations, in places such as family gatherings, offices, classrooms, campuses, residential and dining halls, streets, etc. These situations involved familial, social, occupational, religious, political and recreational domains (Parkinson 1985, Afful 2006, 2007). Naturally occurring data on address forms were often gathered by the researcher and other fieldworkers who took notes on the address forms used as well as the context or setting and background information on interlocutors' social characteristics (Pakinson, 1985).

Also many other studies in the literature (Brown & Gilman 1960, Brown & Ford 1961, Ervin-Tripp 1972, Adeniran 1990, Oyetade 1995) made use of plays in their investigation of address systems motivated by the fact that radio and TV plays provide reliable data in natural social situations. The advantage of using natural data is that such data can eliminate what Labov called "the observer's paradox", since the participants were not aware that they were being studied because the fieldworkers do not manipulate, intervene, direct, or influence the participants' behavior in any way (Oyetade, 1995, p.519).

For instance, in his research on address system in Egyptian Arabic, Parkinson (1985, p.4) stated it was felt that "survey and interview techniques, while providing valuable information, were not an adequate substitute for a large dose of the actual raw data of naturally occurring speech." Parkinson also found that a comparison of the natural data collected by him and his field assistants with a set of interviews about address forms usage done later suggests that "speakers do not necessarily use the terms in the way they say they do (or even in the way they think they use them)" (p.4).

However, one disadvantage of naturally occurring data is that the researcher/fieldworker has to rely on memory. To minimize dependence on memory in this study, the fieldworkers documented the data immediately after their occurrence using a documentation sheet. The fact that terms of address in Palestinian Arabic are usually short nouns or pronouns that repeatedly recur again and again in the same conversation made it easier for the field researchers to remember them for a longer period of time till they recorded them which made the data collection process straightforward.

Another shortcoming of the method of recording natural instances of address is that one normally gets little information on the background of the speakers (Braun, 1988). Braun notes that where sex and approximate age are, of course, easy to determine, social status, education,

regional origin, etc, can be difficult to guess at (p.70). However, in this study, the field researcher identified criteria to operationalize each independent variable to enable the fieldworkers identify context, relationship between participants as well as their social characteristics the same way using uniform criteria.

In this study, 'Operational definitions' as introduced by Bernard (2006) is used through laying a set of instructions and criteria to fieldworkers on how to measure the variables that are hypothesized to be influencing usage and choice of address forms by Palestinian speakers in Gaza. The importance of these operational definitions is that they provide a tool for measurement of variables; without which useful comparisons cannot be made and conclusions cannot be drawn (Bernard, 2006).

To help fieldworkers identify and record the variable of relationship between interlocutors, relationship between participants in the documentation sheet is sub-categorized into relatives, close friends, acquaintances and strangers similar to Turjoman (2005). The relationship between relatives was further sub-categorized by the fieldworkers into child/parent, siblings, niece/aunt or nephew/uncle, grandparent/grandchildren, cousins, and in-laws. The documentation sheet includes a space where fieldworkers can specify the blood relation between relatives. The category of 'close friends' can include those who share views on life as well as personal interests. Acquaintances, on the other hand, will involve those who know each other through a third party while colleagues refer to ones who work together. The researcher was able to get this information from fieldworkers who are familiar with members in their family social network and have asked about others they do not know in larger family gatherings. It was also easy to determine the relationship between persons who work with them in the same workplace. Relationship between interlocutors in public places was determined from the context of conversation, the fieldworkers' understanding of the situation and their general knowledge of the Palestinian community.

Secondly, "Setting" in this study is hypothesized to be one of the independent variables to influence the choice of address forms as a socially-governed behavior among Palestinian speakers in Gaza. In the present study, setting or context refers to interactions in family gatherings, social gatherings, work, schools, hospitals, health centers, campuses, offices, streets, etc. Family gatherings as well as social gatherings, on the one hand, are considered informal settings since all the people attending know each other. However, even in social settings, there are still different levels of what is considered to be formal or informal. For example, in Gaza community a couple will use endearment terms to address each other in privacy, however they try to be more conservative in the way they address each other in front of relatives or the presence of other family members as they tend to use personal names, for example, as being more appropriate. On the other hand, work, school, offices, the health centre settings are considered formal contexts since people from the public may know each other. Even though people who are colleagues in the same duty station have previous knowledge as relatives or friends, they tend to communicate in a more formal way in formal contexts in front of other people. For example, a mother who is a principal of a school where her son works as a teacher will be addressed as Mrs. plus the first name added by her son in front of other staff members. So it will be interesting to see how the way the same persons address each other varies depending on the formality of context.

In determining the participants' age in this study, the fieldworkers would note if participants are very young (7-17), young males and females (18-35), middle-aged (36-55), or older (56 and over). While the fieldworker would be familiar with the approximate age of people they know in social, familial and work domains, the fieldworker would depend on the interlocutors' physical features and way of dress to determine age groups for people they do not know in public places.

To operationalize the age variable, this study follows Miqdadi (2003) who used natural observation to collect data for his research on compliments in Jordanian Arabic. In Miqdadi's study, fieldworkers depended on physical appearance and dress to decide interlocutors' age and traditionalism, two of the main independent variables in his study. According to Miqdadi (2003, p.39), like people of other cultures, physically young Jordanians are wrinkle-free, clear- eyed, and slim-waisted, but their middle-aged counterparts often have wrinkling skins, weight re-apportionments in chest and abdomen, graying hair, and for men thinning hairlines. The older people are furrowed, small-sized, and the men are bald. In the present study that investigates address system in the city of Gaza, the researcher trained fieldworkers to follow Miqdadi's criteria in deciding the age of interlocutors they do not know since Palestinians are like Jordanians and people of all cultures, sharing the same physical features that are correlated with one's being young, middle-aged or old. Also one's age in Gaza can be decided by the way he is dressed. While young and middle-aged men usually put on trousers and shirts in both urban and rural areas, men of high occupational ranks, e.g. in banks and companies, are more likely to wear suits. Also in rural areas, older people tend to wear gowns. While young men and mid-aged women wear clothes of different colors and shapes, many old women usually dress in solid black whole body covers in public places in Gaza.

With respect to deciding the interlocutors' occupation and education, the field workers depended on their previous knowledge of the persons they already know. In family gatherings, it has been easy to identify that since most people know each other and if not the fieldworker asked about the education and occupation of a person they do not know well. When it comes to work and formal settings, one of my fieldworkers is an instructor at college and it was easy for her to get such information about her colleagues and students whom she works with. Another fieldworker is a teacher in a rural area in an elementary school where he is familiar with his colleagues as well as the social backgrounds of his students' parents since he is originally from

the village and spent all his life there and meets with students' parents on a monthly basis. So it was interesting to see how he addresses and is addressed by parents with different social characteristics.

In public places where the fieldworker might not be familiar with people's characteristics of education and occupation, it was interesting to observe how interlocutors who might also be strangers to each other use address forms to address each other in public places as in the street, grocery, clothing shop, gas station, a taxi, etc. Interestingly, it was found that the address term gave the fieldworker information about the interlocutors themselves even if s/he did not know them. For example, a taxi driver would never address a person as 'a doctor' unless he knows he is a doctor whether a physician or a professor at university. By the same token, no person would address someone as 'a driver' unless he knows he is a driver. Yet, a person who is formally-dressed and looks educated may be addressed as 'ustaaz' "literally means professor" which is used in Palestinian Arabic to address male school teachers because of his appearance though he might not be a teacher. So it was interesting to see how these different situations work and under which circumstances.

Finally, as the spoken dialect is one of the social factors that are assumed to have an impact on address behavior among Palestinians in Gaza, the interlocutors' spoken dialect was mainly identified by field researchers as urban, rural or standard in formal settings. As mentioned earlier, the fieldworkers were trained on how to identify certain phonological features, mainly the pronunciation of the voiceless uvular plosive 'qaaf' to determine the dialect of speakers they do not know while it was easy to record the spoken dialect of persons they know.

Furthermore, while informant interviewing and self-administered questionnaires are economical methods for data collection in terms of time and effort despite their other drawbacks, a problem inherent in the method of using natural language data is that it is more time-consuming

and less economical (Braun, 1988, p.310) because this method needs a long period of time to collect data thoroughly and accurately (Beebe and Takahashi, 1989; Hartford and Bardovi-Harling, 1992, all cited in Miqdadi, 2003, p. 42). To avoid this problem, the present study employed 8 highly-educated fieldworkers who gathered data for this study over a period of two months in the research site of Gaza. Despite the fact that longer time and more effort are needed for collecting precise and accurate data, relying exclusively on this method of observing naturally-occurring data is mainly driven by the fact that this method of observation provides a reliable picture of address reality among Palestinian speakers.

3.4 Documentation Sheet

The fieldworkers in this study were provided with a worksheet to document the information they gathered using natural observation. The purpose of designing this sheet is to facilitate the fieldworkers' job by reducing time needed to record an interaction. For most of the items in the documentation sheet, the fieldworkers provided a few words or put a check for the other worksheet items which facilitated recording process and made it straightforward. The work sheet (see Appendices 1, 2) consisted of two main sections:

a) The first section requires documenting details about the exact terms of address used by interlocutors, the relationship between interlocutors, the context/setting as well as general information about the situation itself i.e., place and time, topic of conversation and number of participants.
b) The second section of the documentation sheet requires recording background information about the speaker's and the addressee's social characteristics such as age, gender, appearance or way of dressing in public, education, occupation, the dialect spoken, etc.

The researcher believes that the data recorded give reliable information about address system in Gaza since these forms of address are generally short consisting of a noun or a pronoun which made them easier to memorize and record by the fieldworkers. Where the category or item did not apply to the data, the spaces were left blank in the code sheet. For example, if the participants in a particular interaction are close friends, then the item of '*specify blood relation*' is left blank.

3.5 Fieldworkers

Since the main objective of the study is to investigate the differences in the choice of address forms by gender, age, occupation, education, context and relationship between interlocutors, the study is concerned with collecting data from as many individuals as possible of different social backgrounds. In order to collect as much naturally-occurring data as possible from different groups of age, gender, occupation, and other social background variables in different contexts, it was necessary to train a number of male and female fieldworkers from different parts of Gaza city to obtain as many examples as possible. The fieldworkers who gathered data for this project live in the Gaza Strip, Palestine. They are highly-educated persons who are students or graduates who received their education from Palestinian universities. The researcher has employed an equal number of male and female workers to avoid the problem of lack of access to necessary data because of the sex of the data gatherer (Miqdadi, 2003, p.43). This selection of male and female fieldworkers helped eliminate what Bernard (2006) called the influence of gender on fieldwork. Bernard states "In all cultures…… you can't go into certain areas and situations because you are a [woman] [man]" and that "you can't watch this or report on that because you are a [woman] [man]" (p.373).

In Palestinian Society, similar to other Arab communities, because a large number of people are traditional, interaction between the two genders is often limited, especially in Islamic centers, many wedding parties and some universities. The inclusion of male and female

fieldworkers in the present study aims to cover situations like these to gather data that come from both genders equally.

3.5.1 Training the Fieldworkers

Multi-researcher projects, like the present study, may suffer from the what Bernard (2006, p.115) called problem of 'instrumentation confound' which results from changing measurement instruments and necessitates keeping the data collection instrument constant. To deal with this problem, the present study follows Bernard (2006, p.115) by increasing '*interrator reliability'* through training the fieldworkers of this study to see things and collect data in more or less the same way. The researcher could not travel to the search site of Gaza, Gaza Strip, to do the training, but by using airmail, fax-mail, e-mail, and the telephone similar to what Miqdadi (2003) did in his research on complimenting in Jordanian Arabic, the researcher trained the fieldworkers to collect address forms reliably and precisely. The researcher trained one field worker, a female instructor of English language at the Department of English in a local university in Gaza, on how to collect naturally-occurring data using two methods, theoretical explanations and role-playing situations following the method Miqdadi (2003) used in training his fieldworkers on how to collect data on compliments in Jordanian Arabic. In turn, the researcher's trainee coached other fieldworkers to gather data in the same way. In the following sections, the training that fieldworkers received on how to collect naturally-occurring data is discussed in detail.

In the process of training a field researcher who in turn trained other fieldworkers on how to collect natural examples of terms of address precisely and accurately in Gaza, theoretical explanations were provided including the researcher's explanations to the trainee about the topic of this study and her job as a fieldworker. In order to present the topic of the research, the form and social meaning and function of terms of address were explained to the trainee. The researcher supported her explanations about the topic by many different examples. It was made clear to the

trainee and other fieldworkers that their task is to collect a variety of address forms in different places and settings such as family gatherings, offices, schools, campuses, health centers, streets, shops, mosques, etc. The trainee was also informed that she and other fieldworkers whom she would train are required to record verbatim the exact address forms used by interlocutors and also to note contextual information including the context or setting of the conversation and information about the participants' social background such as gender, age, regional dialect, education, occupation, as well as information on the relationship between interlocutors. Then all these data were documented in a worksheet (see appendices 1, 2) immediately after an interaction event occurred so that it would not be forgotten.

I also needed to make sure that all fieldworkers understand and follow the same documentation procedures while they collect data in the way I explained to them. To ensure that trainee and other fieldworkers can correctly observe and document forms of address in real life situations, a role-playing method was used in the training process to train field researchers to collect different forms of address. The role-playing situations included recorded shows from TV and radio and video-taped speech events in family gatherings. These recorded situations included forms of address that need to be noted by the field researcher under training using the documentation sheet and following the procedures explained to her. The role-playing situations have had the advantage or function of showing the trainee how the researcher would document forms of address she has noted, to help the trainee practice recording data in other interactions she would observe in real life and to determine if the trainee's way in collecting data was as accurate as the researcher's (Miqdadi, 2003, p.48).

The researcher started training by documenting address forms in a recorded speech event from a family gathering or from T.V to explain to the trainee how the researcher herself would be documenting in the worksheet the exact address terms used in that interaction in addition to the

context of the conversation, the relationship between participants as well as all possible information about their social characteristics of gender, age, spoken dialect, education, occupation and any other notes that may be relevant.

Then, the trainee was required to record data individually from other two new situations in the same way used by the researcher in documenting the above situation. The researcher also recorded the data in these two interactions to ensure that the trainee's recording and noting of data was as accurate as the researcher's. When it was found that the two versions were precise the same way, the trainee started training other fieldworkers in the same way she had been coached. If the trainee failed to document forms of address she observed precisely or correctly, the trainee was requested to re-document address forms exchanges to self-correct her errors and she was asked to record occurrences or exchanges of address forms in an additional situation. In the new situation/interaction documented, the researcher documented the data in these scenes to be used as a standard means of documentation. When the trainee's data proved to be as precise as the researcher's, she was asked to train other fieldworkers in the same above way she had been coached.

With the above training to ensure that observation is done right, the researcher intended to void "instrumentation confounds" and reach the objective of "turning fieldworkers into instruments of data collection and data analysis" (Bernard, 2006, p.344).

3.6 Data Collection Procedure

Using participant and non-participant observation, the male and female fieldworkers in this study documented terms of address occurrences verbatim and took notes describing the context in which such utterances occurred.

In participant observation, the fieldworkers collected data from people they often know in a variety of settings e.g. home, social gatherings, neighborhood, mosque, school, work, etc, (Bernard, 2006). All fieldworkers were able to gather data using participant observation in the domain of their families and social gatherings such as family visits, tea parties, wedding parties, friends' gatherings, etc. In these gatherings, the fieldworker asked about any social background information they might not know about speaker or addressee such as occupation and education from persons who know them while gender, age and appearance/way of dressing were easily determined as explained above. Also, using participant observation, the fieldworkers collected many occurrences of different forms of address from people they often know and others they may not know in the domain of their work, e.g., office, campus, school, health centre, etc.

In family gatherings where interaction occurs at the fieldworker's house, whenever a new form of address is used, the fieldworker entered an adjoining room to document it precisely with contextual information. According to Miqdadi (2003), in participant observation it is expected that the fieldworkers may sometimes feel uneasy excusing themselves from conversations to write down data, but generally the field workers of this study preferred to document information as soon as possible in case they would forget the exact term of address especially where there were more than two participants in the interaction and many terms of address were used. However, in cases where the fieldworker did not find it easy to leave the setting to document the information concerned, it is expected that they were able to memorize it for a longer time especially as forms of address in Palestinian Arabic are always short and recur again and again in the conversation and not only for once.

By the same token, at work where it is normal for the fieldworker to hold papers or notebook and a pen, the fieldworkers found it easy to document forms of address they heard

verbatim and also included contextual information about the setting and the participants' age, gender, education and occupation.

In non-participant observation, on the other hand, the fieldworkers gathered naturally-occurring forms of address in public places such as campuses, offices, health-centers, bus and gas stations, and streets. As students, teachers or employees at offices, it is normal for the fieldworkers to carry a bag and notebook most of the time, so it was not difficult for them to write or use their notebooks even in public places e.g., bus stations, taxis, streets to record the address forms they heard in public places. Although naturally occurring forms of address are often expected to be short, hence easy to remember, the field workers were trained on documenting them immediately following their occurrence to ensure that the data are transcribed correctly and accurately.

3.7 Classification/Categorization Scheme of Address Terms in Palestinian Arabic

Due to the inherent differences among languages, the diverse resources available to speakers of each language and the cultural peculiarities of each speech community, it is normal that researchers may adopt different classification schemes in examining address systems in different cultures. As mentioned earlier in section two of this study, Braun (1988, p.9-10) mentioned that in most languages, forms of address concentrate on three word classes: (1) pronoun, (2) verbs, (3) nouns, supplemented by words which are syntactically dependent on them. She added that nouns of address comprise the most diverse types with the following as the most frequent categories: (1) names, (2) kinship terms (KT), (3) forms of address that correspond to the English Mr./Mrs., (4) titles (doctor, major, Duke), (5) abstract nouns (Your Excellency, your Honor), (6) occupational terms, (7) words of certain types of relationship (Arabic *Ja:ri* 'my neighbor', German *Kollege* 'colleague', (8) terms of endearment and (9) some forms that define

addressees as father, brother, wife or daughter of someone else by expressing the addressee's relation to another person e.g. the Arabic *Abu Ali* 'father of Ali.'

Moreover, a literary review of research on address behavior in different settings shows that researchers adapted their own classification schemes that fit the linguistic resources and cultural setting of the communities they examined. For example, in his attempt to describe the Egyptian Arabic system of address terms looking for both the traditional linguistic structure and the social structure of address terms, Parkinson (1985) categorized terms of address in Egyptian Arabic into six categories including the second person pronoun forms, names and labels, family terms, terms of respect, friendly and joking terms and terms of abuse. Mehrotar (1981), on the other hand, elaborates on nine categories of names, honorifics, titles, situation factors, multiple uses of address forms, greeting, invocation, addressing pets and avoidance of address term as possible classification of address terms in Hindi.

Also, in studying the variety of relationship among interlocutors in Columbia, Fitch (1998) identifies five categories of address terms including second-person pronouns, proper names, kinship terms, titles, nicknames and adjectival terms. In addition, in a case study on address terms among university students in Ghana, Afful (2006a) refers to nine principal terms of address. Also in another project of studying non-kinship address terms in Akan, Afful (2006b) classified eight categories that constituted the non-kinship linguistic repertoire used as address forms by Amamoma residents. These categories included personal names, titles, catch phrases, zero address forms, descriptive phrases, attention getters, occupational terms and pronouns. In an attempt to describe the modes of address and address terms in Kannada language spoken in Mysore District in India, Manjulakshi (2004) considers nine types of address terms as; caste name, names by which the exalted status of individuals are revealed or implied, personal name,

kinship term, professional term, professional-names for exaltation, personal name-kinship term, personal name-professional term, and non-respectable term.

The above studies on address systems in diverse linguistic and cultural settings are good examples of the need for having a clear and appropriate categorization scheme in examining and identifying a particular address system. These studies also show how variation in classification schemes of address terms is acceptable in order to reflect the cultural and social characteristics of language users in different cultures and languages since different communities do not necessarily exhibit the same address behavior.

In order to accomplish the goal of providing a comprehensive identification and a clear descriptive analysis of address system among Palestinian speakers in Gaza, I came up with a classification scheme that shares some categories identified by other earlier studies of address systems and at the same time reflects the cultural and linguistic idiosyncratic features of the Palestinian community in Gaza. After examining the data collected in the research site of Gaza by the eight fieldworkers of this study and using my own introspection and intuition as a native speaker of Palestinian Arabic, the collected address terms were classified under twelve categories to be analyzed in the next section. This classification scheme includes the categories of: 1) pronominal forms of address, 2) verb forms of address, 3) names & nicknames, 4) appellatives and terms of intimacy 5) teknonyms, 6) kinship/ family terms, 7) occupation-related terms, 8) terms of formality and general terms of respect, 9) age-related terms, 10) religion-related terms, 11) neutral terms and 12) zero address terms. The reason for developing this classification is that it is expected to present the common Palestinian address terms more clearly according to its social norms and cultural circumstances.

SECTION FOUR: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the results of the present study of address terms in Palestinian Arabic. The forms of address collected by the fieldworkers are analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The analysis reports the different address forms used by Palestinian speakers in the speech community of Gaza and their frequency in the total corpus of the data collected for this study. A qualitative analysis in which the usage of the terms was described from the native speaker's point of view in an effort to include all aspects of the meaning of the term in any particular use is provided. The analysis also shows how the address term choice correlates with the interlocutors' relationship in terms of intimacy or formality, their social characteristics of age, gender, education, occupation, etc as well as the context or setting. Where related, the analysis explains the differences in address behavior based on Brown and Gilman's (1960) and Brown and Ford (1961) address theory and the nature of the Palestinian culture. The discussion will also touch on how the different address categories interact with each other.

4.2 Forms of Address

The corpus of address forms collected in this study contains 1564 instances of address forms that were collected by the 8 fieldworkers in family gatherings, social gatherings, work, school, university, hospital, street, store, etc in the research site of Gaza. The Palestinian Arabic corpus of terms of address system is a large one with a large number of terms available and many variations for many of the terms. In counting the number of instances of address terms, each term of address was counted as one in every communication event or interaction regardless of how many times it occurred in the same conversation or encounter.

The Palestinian Arabic terms of address have been divided into categories for the purpose of understandable presentation in this analysis. They include 1) personal pronouns, 2) verb forms of address, 3) names and nicknames, 4) appellatives and terms of intimacy, 5) teknonyms, 6) kinship/family terms, 7) occupation-related terms, 8) terms of formality and general terms of respect, 9) age-related terms, 10) religion-related terms, 11) neutral address terms, 12) other terms of address and 13) zero address terms. Instead of looking at the whole system in terms of the social variables, each category will be examined individually and an attempt will be made to capture its meaning and usage. The analysis also focuses on how the choice of address forms correlates with the independent variables of setting and context, relationship between interlocutors and interlocutors' social characteristics of age, gender, education, occupation, etc. Differences in the address terms choice are discussed in light of address theory and the nature of the Palestinian culture/community. Before discussing each category in detail, the frequency/percent of the occurrence of each category in the overall data is summarized in table 1.

Table 1: **Frequency/Percent of the different categories of address terms according to their occurrence in the natural data.**

Category	**Frequency** (%)
1. Personal pronouns	59/ (3.8)
2. Verb forms of address	26/(1.6)
3. Names	562 (35.9)
3.1 Personal names & nicknames	532 (34)
3.2 Full formal name	23 (1.5)
3.3 Family name only	7 (0.4)
4. Appellatives and terms of intimacy	57 (3.6)
5. Teknonyms	231 (14.8)
6. Kinship/family terms	296 (19)
7. Occupation-related terms	209 (13.3)
8. Terms of formality and general terms of respect	26 (1.6)
9. Age-related term	35 (2.2)
10. Religion-related terms	23 (1.5)
11. Neutral terms	27 (1.7)
12. Other forms of address	13 (0.2)
Total	**1564/(100.0)**

4.3 Pronominal Forms of Address

Oyetade (1995) notes that pronouns, apart from their grammatical functions, have been reported to perform a social function by signaling the disparity in the status of the speaker and addressee. In Palestinian Arabic, the 2nd person pronoun forms perform this social function as they are significantly used as address forms. Similar to what Parkinson (1985) noted about pronominal forms of address in Egyptian Arabic, these forms in Palestinian Arabic, which correspond to "T pronoun" in the Brown/Gilman terminology include the subject pronouns *ʔinta, ʔinti and ʔintu* (you masculine singular, feminine singular and plural), the object pronoun endings –ak, -ik and –kum and their phonological variants which can be the objects of verbs or possessive pronouns, and the second person verb conjugations which are usually used without an expressed pronoun subject. This latter category of the second person verb conjugations include the perfect forms that end in –t, -ti and –tu, and the imperfect forms that begin with *ti-*. These forms of *ʔinta* are very pervasive as address forms in spoken

Palestinian Arabic which could be traced back to the linguistic structure of Arabic as an inflected language and the fact that, in Islam and Arab culture, it is crucial that interlocutors, regardless of their status or rank, should acknowledge each other as partners in a conversation as a sign of showing respect. One of the most important ways in which people fulfill this social communicative function in their speech is naturally and constantly referring to the person they are talking to where using the second person forms is one of the easiest ways of making this reference.

Table 2: Forms of 2nd person pronouns used as address forms in Palestinian Arabic

	Singular	**Plural**
Subject/spoken form		
Masculine	ʔinta	ʔintu
Feminine	ʔinti	ʔintu/ʔinten
Subject/Standard form		
Masculine	ʔanta	ʔantum
Feminine	ʔanti	ʔantum/ʔantunna
Object Pronoun endings		
Masculine	-ak	-kum
Feminine	-ik	-kum/kin
Second Person Verb Conjugations		
Perfect forms		
Masculine	-t	-tu
Feminine	-ti	-tu/tin
Imperfect forms		
Masculine	ti-	ti-
Feminine	ti-	ti-

Also, similar to what Parkinson (1985, p.16) noted about the second person pronouns in Egyptian Arabic, although these pronominal forms fit the definition of "terms of address" in their being forms that refer to the addressee in a face-to-face speech event, they do not fit into the Arabic local category of ʔ*alqaab* roughly 'real terms of address.' The main syntactic difference between pronouns and ʔ*alqaab "lit, terms of address"* in Arabic is that forms in this latter category almost always come after the vocative particle '*ya'* and are thus somewhat

separated from the primary grammatical relations of the sentences in which they are being used. In other words, unlike the second person forms, these Arabic terms of address never function as the grammatical subjects, objects or oblique objects of the sentences in which they are used. Rather, they are purely vocative, used to get addressee's attention or to maintain contact with him as the addressee during the course of the conversation (Parkinson, 1985). The second person forms, on the other hand, constantly take the role of the primary grammatical relations of the sentences in which they occur and function as subjects, objects or oblique objects of these sentences. This distinction between pronouns and real terms of address ʔ*alqaab* in Arabic corresponds to Braun's (1988) distinction between bound forms of address that are integrated parts of sentences and syntactically free forms that are outside the sentence construction; preceding; succeeding, or inserted into the sentence. In this sense, similar to English, German and other languages, Palestinian Arabic second person pronouns of address tend to appear as bound forms while nominal forms of address occur as free forms. Thus, in the data collected, it was quite common for a sentence to contain both a "real" term of address, and one or more second person forms, as in:

- Ruh-**ti** ʕala ʔel ʔijtemaaʕ imbareħ *ya* Muna?

  Did **you** go to the meeting yesterday, Muna?

It is to be noted, however, that the forms *ʔinta/ ʔinti* 'you. Sing.' are not the only second person pronouns used as address forms in Palestinian Arabic, rather they have many variants; the use of which as address forms is socially significant. Table 3 lists the different pronominal address forms that are explained below with the frequency/percent of their occurrence.

Table 3: Frequency/percent of Second Person Pronoun Forms in the data

2nd Person Pronominal form	**Frequency (%)**
the dialectal non-inflected subject ʔinta/ʔinti forms	36/ (61)
The classical ʔanta/ʔanti forms	7/ (11.9)
Plural form of ʔanta to address a singular person	2/ (3.39)
The form *ħaḏertak/ ħaḏˁertik*	12/ (20.3*)*
The form *faḏˁiltak*	2/ (3.39)
Total	**59/(100.0)**

In the data collected, there were 36 instances of the dialectal/colloquial non-inflected subject pronouns *ʔinta/ʔinti /ʔintu*, which function similar to the pronoun '*Tu'* in European languages, as the only bearers of address function in a conversation. The use of second person pronoun in some of these instances where the pronoun was the only form of address in a conversation was mainly correlated with the relationship between participants and their age. The second person pronoun is used from parents to children, for example, or reciprocally between age mates, friends, brothers and sisters operating on the solidarity dimension, on the one hand, or used downwards from superiors to inferiors, e.g. a teacher to a student, a boss to an employee, etc, on the other hand. Another observation is the use of second person pronoun between interlocutors who are slightly or not at all acquainted with each other. These interlocutors found the use of second person pronoun an appropriate way of avoiding the difficulty of choosing an address term to address a person whom they are not familiar with. These examples were recorded between a taxi driver and riders, a seller and a customer in a store, etc. It was also noted that this use mainly correlates with the age of the addressee. The pronoun *ʔinta* or one of its forms is primarily used to address young and middle-aged addressees. However, when the speaker thinks the addressee to be 15 years older than themselves, they tend to choose a term of address that they think to be appropriate even if they do not know the speaker. For example, a kinship term like *ʕam* "paternal uncle" may be extended to address someone the speaker thinks to be as old as his father or *yamma* 'mother'

or *xala* ‘aunt/mother’s sister’ to address an older woman whom they think to be as old as one’s mother. Other terms of address could be used based on the speaker’s understanding of the situation and his general knowledge of the Palestinian community in Gaza.

Another interesting observation about the use of the second person subject pronouns is that instead of the spoken dialectal form of the T pronoun *ʔinta/ʔinti* discussed above, a speaker may use their classical or standard Arabic counterparts *ʔanta/ʔanti*. Interestingly, this small instance of code-switching can serve to demonstrate the speaker’s education or educational background in society rather than the addressee’s background. As Braun (1988) indicated, switching to a formal style, can, of course express deference to the addressee as well, but deference is not necessarily implied. In this respect, use of *ʔanta/ʔanti* need not symbolize the addressee’s status, but the status of its user who displays knowledge and education. This occurrence of the standard Arabic form of *ʔanta/ʔanti* occurred seven times in the data; four of which are by a professor of Arabic language addressing his students at college. The other three examples came from a religious T.V program where the guest is a religious scholar and used the classical Arabic forms of second person pronouns to address his audience. In Gaza and other Arab countries, religious education is associated with the standard form of Arabic; the linguistic form used in the Holy Qura’n and other religious scholarship. So in these instances, using the standard form of the second person pronoun in addressing audience characterized the speaker as a religious or linguistic scholar. In these examples, the use of standard Arabic second person singular pronoun *ʔanta/ʔanti* serves as an indicator of the speaker’s education and status and may be regarded as operating on what Braun (1988) called the dimension of self-representation in the choice of a particular address form.

A further observation about the use of the second person pronouns is that although typically the masculine singular forms are used with masculine singular addressees, the feminine singular forms with feminine singular addressees, and the plural forms to a group of

more than one addressee, on rare occasions the plural form *ʔantum* can be used in Arabic to address a singular addressee. Similar to what Parkinson (1988) noted about Egyptian Arabic, this type of usage would usually involve an extremely formal situation and a very high addressee. In the present study, two instances of this use of using a plural form of *ʔinta* to address a singular person were recorded from a television program, in which a journalist addressed a minister in a press conference using the plural form upwards which corresponds with Brown and Gilman's axis of power.

Moreover, similar to what Braun (1988) found about Jordanian Arabic, the data collected for this study also show that the above second person pronouns (T pronoun in Brown/Gilman distinction) in Palestinian Arabic are opposed to several bound forms of "politeness", the most important of which is *ħaḏˁertak/ħaḏˁertik* (masc./fem. 'your presence') and *faḏˁiltak (Your Excellency*, used exclusively to address Moslem Sheikhs*)*, the function of which corresponds to the function of a "V pronoun" in European languages.

- The form *faḏˁiltak* 'Your Excellency', which occurred 2 times in the data, is used exclusively by speakers to address Muslim sheikhs, and is normally restricted to rather high class sheikhs. For example:

1. After introducing the subject of the discussion, the TV announcer on a religious affairs program says to the sheikh who was the show's guest:

   - momken netʕaraf ʕala raʔi *faḏˁiltak* fi haadhehi al qadiya?

     Can we know the opinion of your Excellency in this topic?

2. The form *ħaḏˁertak/ħaḏˁertik* occurred 12 times in the data. Nine of these occurrences were used by students to address their professors at school and the other three were recorded as a form of addressing an official of high rank e.g. a bank manager.

   Ex: a female student asks her professor if he has time to talk to her.

   Ya Doktoor, mumken ʔaħki ma' *ħaḏˁertak* xams daqayeq.

Doctor, Can I speak with *your presence* for five minutes?

In the above example, a term of address *doctor* is used after the vocative *ya*, in addition to *ħaḏˁertak* as a bound form of address that is integrated in the structure of the sentence and has a grammatical relation.

In his study of terms of address in Egyptian Arabic, Parkinson (1985) refers to the forms *ħaḏˁertak/ħaḏˁertik, faḏˁiltak* and two other forms in Egyptian Arabic as "*sisters of ʔinta*." Similar to Egyptian Arabic, *ħaḏˁertak/ħaḏˁertik* and *faḏˁiltak* form a swing category between "real" terms of address and the second person pronoun forms. In Arabic, they are included under the category *ʔalqaab*, but they never appear with the vocative particle *ya* and like the second person pronouns they take part in the primary grammatical relations of the sentences in which they appear, functioning as the subject, object, or oblique object in the sentence and in general replacing the *ʔinta* forms wherever it appears. There, is however, no special verb conjugation for these forms, so when they are the subject of a verbal sentence they are added as an expressed and not inflected subject while a form of *ʔinta* would normally be left out in such a situation. These forms, therefore, have some of the qualities of normal terms of address, and some of the qualities of normal second pronouns, but are fully neither, and must be placed somewhere in between the two categories (Parkinson, 1985).

In Palestinian Arabic, the form *ħaḏˁertak/ħaḏˁertik* 'masc. fem. your presence' varies with the forms of *ʔinta* in a way similar to that of the Tu/Vous variation in several European languages as described by Brown and Gillman (1960). In the present study, *ħaḏˁertak* is used to addressees who are above speaker in some hierarchy which corresponds to what Brown called the "power" axis. However, no examples were recorded of using *ħaḏˁertak* to addressees who are equal to a speaker but have a formal rather than intimate relationship with him operating on what Brown called the "solidarity" axis. Similar to what Parkinson (1985) noted about Egyptian Arabic, Palestinian speakers refer to the same phenomena of power/

solidarity dimensions when they use the words *iḥtiraam* 'respect,' and *kulfa or takliif* 'formality, ceremonial courtesy,' when discussing the form *ħaḏˁertak*. The second person pronoun forms, on the other hand, mark the opposite, either the fact that speaker is higher than addressee in some hierarchy, or that the relationship between them is an intimate one in which the rules of formality are not followed.

Looking at the context where the form *ħadḏˁertak* occurred indicates that the addressee's occupational/educational rank and age are all significant in using this form versus a second person pronoun or a nominal form of address. The examples where this form is used indicate that middle-aged and old addressees receive the terms much more than do young, and that the higher the occupational and/or educational status of an addressee, the more likely they are to receive *ħaḏˁertak.* Though *ħaḏˁertak* (masc.) and *ħaḏˁertik (*fem.) can be used to address males and females, it seems there is a tendency to use it more to address males though the number of examples recorded is not enough to make such conclusion. So it is still a tendency rather than an absolute that speakers are much more likely to choose *ħaḏˁertak* to address men than they would be if addressing women in a similar situation. Instead, in addressing women whose position entails receiving a high form of respect, speakers choose another term like, *sitt* "Mrs." or possibly avoid using a term at all.

Moreover, the use of *ħaḏˁertak/ ħaḏˁertik* as opposed to the use of *ʔinta/ʔinti* and its variants is not only dependent on the relationship between speaker and addressee or the addressee's characteristics, but also on the social and linguistic background of the speaker which is also significant for the choice of these forms. In Palestinian Arabic, rural and less educated people use *hadirtak/hadirtik* to address their interlocutors to a much lesser extent than do educated and urban speakers. Thus the tendency to be expected following Brown/Gilman (1960) and Brown/Ford (1961) using *ʔinta/ʔinti* to inferiors and intimates as opposed to using *ħaḏˁertak/ ħaḏˁertik* to superiors and non-intimates cannot be necessarily

established. In the data collected, there are two examples where a high status speaker uses *ʔinta/ʔinti* to a lower status speaker because the status relation allows him/her to do so. Yet instead of using *ħaqᶜertak* – the form that is similar to vous- the lower status speaker returned *ʔinta* to the higher status addressee, because the variant *ħaqᶜertak* simply does not exist in the speaker's repertory. This example shows that reciprocity may occur without any egalitarian background, simply because the interlocutors apply different rules of address (Braun, 1988). Braun (1988) elaborates that this implies the difficulty which may arise in trying to apply the notions of reciprocity and non-reciprocity under these circumstances. This also points out that in examining the usage of address terms in a particular context, language and culture-specific principles that govern the proper usage of address terms should be considered.

With regard to the relationship between participants, the speakers used *ħaqᶜertak* to both speakers with whom they are only slightly or not at all acquainted with e.g. manager of a bank, but whom they recognize as being of a higher occupational rank as well as to a well-known addressee e.g. their professor at college. The determining factor in this use is the addressee's occupational and/or educational rank followed by age in addition to the speaker's linguistic and educational background as the data show that speakers who use *ħaqᶜertak* versus a second person pronoun are educated or urban speakers. Females are not different from males in giving *ħaqᶜertak* while most of the examples that occurred in the data were used to males. The use of this form of *ħaqᶜertak* versus *ʔinta/ʔinti* operates on the power and solidarity axes. The term can be used both up to an unequal addressee above speaker on a power scale, and across to an addressee equal to speaker but who is distant or not an intimate friend. Yet all examples that occurred in the data are used to an addressee above speaker on a power scale.

To summarize the analysis of the usage of second person pronoun forms and the polite forms *ħaqᶜertak/ ħaqᶜertik*, it was mentioned that *ʔinta/ʔinti* in Palestinian Arabic appear to vary with *ħaqᶜertak* in much the same way the singular pronoun 'T' varies with the plural one

'V' for singular addressees in several European languages (the Tu/Vous variation). The determining factors are age and status; e.g., an older person of high education or occupational rank uses *ʔinta/ʔinti* for a younger addressee, and receives *ħaq̣ˁertak* in return. Among friends, peers and age mates, the intimate forms of second person pronoun or given names are used reciprocally. This shows that, to a great extent, power and solidarity considerations regulate the use of pronouns as address forms in Palestinian Arabic.

4.4 Verbs of Address

According to Braun (1988), verb forms of address are verbs in which reference to the interlocutor is expressed, e.g., by means of inflectional suffixes of second person pronouns. Braun adds that frequently such verb forms are redundant, that is, they are accompanied by a pronoun or nominal form of address. But in languages where the use of subject pronouns is not obligatory, the verb can be the only bearer of the interlocutor reference. For example, in the Arabic sentence *wain ruh-**et**?* "Where did ***you*** go?" The verb *ruhe-t* constitutes a form of address, for the inflectional suffix –t (second person singular) is the only element expressing reference to the interlocutor.

In this study, it was found that these verbs, which are inflected for the second person pronoun forms referred to above, can also be used as a form of address to designate the interlocutor in a conversation. They occurred frequently in every conversation since verbs in Arabic are inflected for subject and person. However, the focus here is on these verbs that occurred at the beginning of a conversation as the only bearer of the interlocutor reference without being accompanied by a pronominal and nominal form of address. The collected data included 26 instances of this use of verb forms of address. I found that the main significant factor in using these verbs alone without another form of address is the relationship between

interlocutors as this form is mainly used between strangers or people who are not familiar with each other in public places e.g., street, school, store, etc.

In most of the examples when verb forms of address were used among strangers, it was observed that the speaker found that using a verb form of address is the appropriate way of addressing an interlocutor with whom they are not familiar. In other words, verb forms of address are mainly used by Palestinian speakers when they are in doubt as to how to address people. It was found that some speakers avoid the difficulty of choosing an appropriate form for addressing someone they are not familiar with by using a verb form of address or using attention getters or greetings. For example, the data show that a common strategy to start a polite conversation to ask someone they are not familiar with about something is by saying "Excuse me, would **you** please?" or can **you** please tell me? As in the following examples,

- An undergraduate student at a local university at Gaza asks a secretary at the registrar office about grades by saying:

- Law samah-**t** momken teshabli kashf darajaat.

  Would **you (mas. Sing)** please give me a transcript?

- Another girl asks a passer-by about the directions of going to education department at UNRWA to apply for a job,

- Law Samaht-**ti** wain qesem el taaleem?

  Can **you (Fem. sing)** tell me how to go to Education Department, please?

In addition to their being used between strangers, verb forms of address can also used at the beginning of a face-to-face conversation as the only bearers of address between friends and relatives, where the degree of formality is low and a high degree of intimacy or solidarity exists, without adding a name or another form of address.

- Ruhe-**t**-ala el shoghol imbareh?

  Did **you (mas.)** go to work yesterday?

- Katab-**ti** el wajeb wala lesa?

  Did **you (fem.)** do your homework or not yet?

In addition to the degree of acquaintanceship among interlocutors as a main factor in determining this behavior of using a verb form of address, it is also noted that similar to the non-inflected second person subject pronouns *ʔinta/ʔinti* this behavior is correlated with interlocutors' age and gender. This form is more likely to be used between interlocutors of opposite sex and younger ages. As a traditional community, young Palestinian males and females who are strangers to each other tend to keep the distance between them and one of the ways to do this is the way they address each other by avoiding using a term of address that may not be appropriate.

4.5 Nominal Forms of Address

This section of the study analyzes all nominal forms of address that were recorded in this study. This category of address terms includes the most diverse types and largest number of address forms. According to Braun (1988), nominal terms of address are substantives and adjectives which designate interlocutors or refer to them in some way.

Before approaching each type in detail, it is relevant here to talk briefly about the syntax of nominal terms of address in Palestinian Arabic. Unlike *ʔinta/ʔinti* and other forms of second person pronouns which have a role in the primary grammatical relations of the sentences in which they occur, the nominal forms of address do not play a primary relational role in sentences. Rather they are purely vocative and almost always come after the vocative particle ***ya*** and are thus somewhat separated from the primary grammatical relations of the sentences in which they are being used. Similar to what Parkinson (1985, p.32) noted about Egyptian Arabic terms of address, these nominal forms in Palestinian Arabic have a vocative force, outside of and peripheral to the primary structure of the sentence which is the reason for these forms' not having a fixed slot in the sentence. With respect to their occurrence in a

sentence, the nominal address forms in Palestinian Arabic tend to occur: 1) at the beginning of a sentence particularly when it is the first sentence in an entire discourse and the term is used to get addressee's attention, 2) after the first word (or phrase of a sentence), and 3) at the end of a sentence. The data collected also show that the internal structure of Palestinian Arabic terms of address is also fairly straightforward, although there are a few variations. These possibilities of how terms of address can occur in a sentence can be categorized as: 1) a personal name/nickname/or teknonym alone is used almost exclusively to call an addressee or get his attention and in most of the cases it is accompanied by the vocative *ya* though it may occur without *ya* especially at the beginning of a sentence, 2) a personal name or a teknonym with an address term, 3) a term of address alone without a name occurring most of the time after the vocative particle *ya*; with these three forms being completely unrestricted. Some other variations are possible but they are somewhat constrained by which terms can be used where. For example, some terms are never used with a name and some others come before a name while others should come after a name. Before analyzing each nominal form of address in more detail, it is important here to bear in mind that despite their somewhat peripheral nature as a linguistic subsystem, terms of address are used to perform much communicative work (Parkinson, 1985). Such communicative work includes "their being capable of beginning and maintaining discourse, marking speaker and address and their relationship and manipulating that relationship, and in general defining the communicative context of the discourse" (p.41).

4.5.1 Names

4.5.1.1 Personal Names and Nicknames

As prototypical forms or terms of address, names are the most common form of address among Gaza speakers. There are 542 instances of given personal names and nicknames used alone in the data without an additional term of address. As Parkinson (1985) notes, several aspects of naming behavior are common to modern western languages, Arabic

and most other languages. First, everyone has a name, no exceptions. The name is given to a person by his parents at birth and as a general rule he can't, or doesn't care to do anything about changing it. In Arabic the main name of an Arab person is the *ʔism*, his or her personal name (e.g. "Kareem" or "Fatima"). Most Arabic names are originally Arabic words with a meaning, usually signaling the good character of the person. In Islam, parents are required to choose a name with good meaning for their baby from the reservoir of possible names. For example, *Karīm* means "generous", *"Sadeq"* means "honest", and both words are employed as adjectives and nouns in regular language. These names are arbitrary labels used for identifying, referring to and addressing the people in one's environment. Though in Arab culture, a person's ancestry and their family name are very important, the personal name that parents pick for their child is the one that is mainly used as a form of address. While the choice of the baby's first name by parents could be partially random, in Arab culture this choice is somewhat constrained by who they think they are, particularly in regards to religion, generation and social class (Parkinson, 1985). With respect to religion, for example, speakers in Gaza and other Arab countries make a distinction between three categories of names: the ones that are limited to Muslims, the ones limited to Christians and the category of neutral names that are available to both Muslims and Christians. Also naming in Palestinian community is associated with some common cultural practices. For example, naming a son after the grandfather on the father's side but not, for example, after the father is a very common naming practice**.**

Examples from the data:

- Kaif sawaiti fi el ʔimtehaan *ya* **Hana**?

  How you did in the exam, **Hana (fem.)**?

- **Khaled**, wain maħalak 'el jdeed?

  Khaled (mas.), where is your new business located?

In addition to the personal name given to a baby, some children may be optionally given a nickname. The Arabic term for nickname in Arabic is *ʔism dalaʕ* which implies intimacy and playfulness. As Parkinson (1985) notes about nicknames in Egyptian Arabic, giving someone a nickname is sometimes done by choice and sometimes just happens. Parkinson notes "nicknames, like names, are a limited set of usually derived forms that everyone accepts as nicknames although there is somewhat more room for creativity here than there is with names" (1985, p. 45). Most of the nicknames collected in this study are clearly derived from the personal names, e.g., *hamaada* for *Muhammed, lolo* for *Ola, etc*. Other nicknames are chosen at random with no relationship to the name of the person, e.g., *Darsh* for Mustafa, *Abu ʕali* for Hassan. Other nicknames could be chosen according to a quality or characteristic referring to the person. Table 4 provides a list of some the common nicknames that were recorded in this study.

Table 4: Some Common Nicknames in Palestinian Arabic.

Female nicknames **Male nickname**

Name	**Nickname**	**Name**	Nickname
Sawsan	Soso	Mo*ħ*ammed	*ħ*amaada
Wafaa'	Fofo	Ahmad	Hammodi
Ola	Lolo	*ħ*assan	Abuʕali
Shiriin	Shuushu	Mustafa	Darsh
Dana	Dodo	'ismaiil	Sumʕa
Rana/Rania	Ranoosh	Nabiil	Bulbul
Fatma	Fatoom/Fatooma	ʕbdAllah	ʕabudi

With respect to the usage of nicknames as forms of address in Palestinian Arabic, the nickname may become the person's intimate name, in which case it is the only name heard in the family setting and among friends whereas the given name is used only in school and other formal situations. For example, the nickname *Hamada*, which is used frequently to address persons whose personal name is Mohammed, occurred 8 times in the data and it appears to be

typically an intimate nickname used as a form of address in most occasions. In some other cases, the given personal name is kept for general serious interaction both among intimates and non-intimates, and the nickname becomes less of a name for a person and may become limited to joking and friendly usage. As mentioned earlier, the nickname may not be derived from the personal name but may also include words referring to some salient characteristic of the person referred to. An instance of this use in the data is the word *xabeer* 'expert' which is used frequently by a group of friends to address their friend who keeps giving his opinions about others' affairs and situation even if he is not asked to. Another interesting example is using the word *failasoofa* 'philosopher' as a nickname in a family setting to address a 9-year-old girl who uses the language cleverly and always comes up with unfamiliar ideas and suggestions that her family do not expect.

An examination of the usage of names and nicknames that occurred in the data shows that names, as forms of address in Palestinian Arabic, can be used either alone or in connection with another address term. Most of the other address terms can also be used alone without the name. Similar to what Parkinson (1985) found in Egyptian Arabic, this variation produces a broad three-way distinction in term of address usage in general; each of which is associated with a particular social meaning or function. If a speaker chooses to address a person using the name alone, this reflects a relationship of intimacy or inferiority on the part of addressee and lack of *kulfa* 'formality.' Second, choosing the name with another address term reflects acquaintance but also involves distance or respect. Third, using an address term alone reflects no acquaintance, distance and *kulfa* respect/formality.

The data indicate that well-known addressees receive far more names alone than do any others, and totally unknown addresses receive almost entirely pronominal and verbal forms of address or terms of address that the speaker thinks to be appropriate according to the situation. In terms of Brown/Gilman's (1960) model of solidarity/intimacy and power/distance

axes, personal names alone are most common in situations in which speaker is speaking across and in which he is intimately acquainted with addressee, or when he is speaking down and at least somewhat acquainted with addressee. Names with terms are common when a speaker is speaking across or up to an addressee with whom he is acquainted but with whom he is not intimate or when the addressee is of a higher rank.

This shows that the strongest constraint in using a name or a nickname versus other forms of address is the specific relationship and degree of acquaintance between the participants of the speech event. Around 85% of the 542 names and nicknames used alone in this study involved a degree of intimacy between the participants and were used across or slightly down. They were used to address children, siblings, friends, relatives, neighbors and colleagues of speaker. The main implication of this result is that well-known addressees and intimates normally operate on a mutual first-name basis. That the use of first names and nicknames in the present study occurred among interactants of equal status, thus reflecting great intimacy, is supported by what Wardhaugh (1992, p.267) noted that "knowing and using another's first name is, of course, a sign of considerable intimacy or at least of a desire for such intimacy. Using a nickname or pet name shows an even greater intimacy." The other 15% of the names used alone involved down usages to known but non-intimate addressees e.g. teachers to students, managers to workers, etc. The frequency of the usage of the 542 instances of personal names and nickname used alone - without another address term- according to relationship between participants is summarized in table 5.

Table5: Frequency/Percent of personal names/nicknames use according to the Relationship between Participants

Relationship	**Frequency (%)**
Usage between equals	**464/(85.6)**
Relatives	194/(33.8)

Friends	152/(28)
neighbors and colleagues of speaker, etc	118 (22.4)
Down usage to known but non-intimate addressees	**78 (14.4)**
teachers to students, bosses to workers, etc	78 (14.4)
Total	542 /(100.0)

In addition to the relationship between participants, the independent variables of interlocutors' age, occupational/educational rank and sex are all significant. The next strongest constraint is age as the data indicate that names are usually used to addressees the same age or younger than the speaker and of the same or lower educational/occupational rank. Addressee's age is fairly important to the use of names and nicknames in the Palestinian community and Arab culture in general. It is rare and considered impolite and rude for any speaker to address someone much older than himself with a name alone and even older speakers tend to avoid using the personal name alone to old addressees.

Among acquaintances, the data also indicate that names alone are more likely to be used between interlocutors of the same sex rather than across opposite sexes. The use of names alone is more likely to be reciprocal from a male to male or from a female to a female rather than from a male to female or vice versa. For example, colleagues of opposite sex will prefer to use a teknonym or an appropriate term with the name rather than the personal name alone when addressing a colleague of opposite sex. As a traditional conservative community, the usage of forms of address is one of the ways female speakers can keep the distance with male speakers at work, for example, to maintain a degree of distance, formality and respect. Yet this is still a tendency and not an absolute depending on the interaction of other factors such as age and what degree of acquaintanceship interlocutors have.

As indicated earlier, the choice of a personal name as an address form versus other forms such as titles or teknonyms depends on factors like age, intimacy, acquaintanceship, the

situation in which the speech event is taking place, and the speaker's intent. With respect to what Brown and Gilman called reciprocity versus non-reciprocity in address behavior, the choice of personal names to address someone could be one of two patterns: mutual and reciprocal exchange of personal name, on the one hand, or non-reciprocal exchange of personal name, on the other, where one speaker gives a personal name and receives a term of address or title in return or vice versa. The reciprocal patterns are guided by such factors as equality in age, familiarity, intimacy, acquaintanceship, sex and situation. Data of the present study show that the reciprocal use of personal name is the rule among friends, close associates, and members of the same peer (or age) group. The major determinants of the non-reciprocal counterpart, on the other hand, are age, gender, occupational rank, education, relationship between participants and setting. In this pattern, an older person addresses a younger person by personal name, but the latter dares not to address the former in the same way. It is considered impolite, rude, and insolent in the Palestinian community to address by first name an older person, who is 15 years or more older than the speaker, even if the speaker outranks the addressee in education or occupation. In addressing a much older person with whom one is involved in a dyadic relationship, an appropriate term of address or a term plus the name should be picked according to the situation but not the first name alone. If the addressee is educated, an appropriate term or title that fits his occupation and/or educational rank is picked to address him. Other appropriate forms include a teknonym- where the addressee is addressed as father of/or mother of *fulaan* where *fulaan* stands for older son's first name- or addressing them as *haj-hajje* 'pilgrim' or a generic kinship term like *ʕam* 'uncle' which all would be an appropriate and polite way of addressing both educated and uneducated old people in the Palestinian community. The kinship terms usually employed if the addressee seems approximately of the same age or older than one's parents include *ʕam* "uncle/father's

brother," or *xaa*l "mother's brother" to an elderly man, and *xaala* "aunt/mother's sister" to an elderly woman.

This situation in Palestinian Arabic where age may supersede rank goes contrary to the situation that Brown & Ford (1961) described about American address forms, where occupational status takes precedence over age in addressing an older member of lower rank in an organization. In this type of situation in Palestinian Arabic, reciprocal or mutual exchange of a term of respect is the rule; i.e., the older member gives title or term of respect with or without name to the younger boss, who returns a term of respect- e.g., a teknonym- rather than first name alone due to the age difference.

The fact that age may supersede occupational rank in the Palestinian address system can be traced back to the value given to family relationships where showing respect to older people is paramount in Arab culture. This is reinforced by Islam which considers caring for one's parents and older people an honor and a blessing. It is an Islamic rule that older people should be treated mercifully, with kindness and selflessness. The respect for parents and people of the same age occupies a special place in the moral and social teachings of Islam, and hence in the social structure of a Moslem community. Accordingly, one of the ways you respect and show caring for your elders is the way you greet and address them when you see them.

In summary, the analysis of the data on names and nicknames used alone indicate that they are more likely to be used if the relationship between participants is intimate and a speaker is speaking across or down or if a speaker is speaking down and s/he at least knows the addressee somewhat. They are more likely to be used if the speaker is old and the addressee is young and if the interlocutors are of the same sex. Similar to what Parkinson (1985, p. 53) noted about Egyptian Arabic, it is evident that the usage of names and nicknames is similar to the personal pronoun *ʔinta* forms in that they are used to mark

solidarity or intimacy between interlocutors or a relationship in which speaker is higher than addressee on a power scale. On the other hand terms of respect and titles used alone or with names are similar to *ħaḏʿertak/ħaḏʿertik* 'your presence' in that they typically mark the presence of kulfa "formality" or non-intimacy in a relationship, or the fact that speaker is addressing someone higher than himself on a power scale. These findings mean that Brown's model of power and solidarity fits both the pronoun and the term of address systems in Palestinian Arabic.

4.5.1.2 Full Formal Name

When asked to introduce oneself at school or university, or in an interview, for example, a Palestinian speaker in Gaza will give his own personal name, his father's name and his *laqab* 'family name/surname.' Occasionally, some speakers may give their grandfather's name. This is due to the fact that in Arab culture, a person's ancestry and his/her family name are very important, so speakers tend to give them when introducing themselves. This pattern of full formal name does not occur in ordinary day-to-day conversation between interlocutors, but is invariably found in formal situations like school, hospital, banks, and law courts. In calling the roll at school, for example, the full names are called with no titles. But in law courts, the full names of petitioners are called, together with their titles in the proceeding. It is only in such extremely formal contexts that we have this type of address. The 23 instances where this pattern occurred in the data include calling students' names at school, in a company where many customers were waiting for their transaction to be completed and the full formal name was used to prevent any confusion in case customers have similar first and family names, for example. Other examples were recorded in a health centre where the clerk read the full formal name of a patient to come and take their file as it was their turn to see the doctor.

4.5.1.3 Family Name only

The practice of addressing people by title and family name is foreign to the Palestinian community. Therefore, it is uncommon for interlocutors in Gaza to address each other by title and surname or surname only. However, seven instances of this use were recorded in the present study and all of them were used by males to address males. Three of these instances were from a secondary school teacher who used this form to address his male pupils. An interesting observation that the fieldworker recorded about this usage is that the three students have the same first personal name, so in order for the teacher to distinguish them, he just called each one of them by his family name. This usage shows that some individual practices could be a part of the address behavior in a particular community. The other four occurrences of this usage were between male teenage friends who call each other by their family names because they view it as a friendly and intimate way of addressing each other and showing their own identity and solidarity as a group.

So far, the above section has discussed the various forms of address by names, and it is evident that the types used are guided by the dictates or the norms of the Palestinian society. The influence of degree of acquaintanceship between participants and age is pervasive in this regard which is equally the case in other forms of address in Palestinian Arabic.

4.5.2 Appellatives and Terms of Intimacy

In his investigation of non-kinship address terms in Akan, Ghana, Afful (2006b) found that the most commonly used appellatives involve nicknames, endearment terms and terms of solidarity. Similarly, 57 instances of these terms occurred in the natural data of the present study which show that Palestinian speakers draw on terms of solidarity, endearment and affection terms in addition to nicknames, discussed above, as the most common types of appellatives and terms of intimacy.

As a mode of address, terms of solidarity are terms used in situations where intimate interlocutors need to address partners in a conversation with more friendly and more amiable tone. Intimacy here refers to the relationship where the speaker considers the addressee as a member of an in-group, a friend or a person who shares some commonality with the speaker, so they address him using an intimate address term to show this close relationship. Some of the forms collected in this study as address terms which are more or less used in situations where there is an intimate relationship between the two parties include *rafeeq (*masc. sing.) 'companion', *'azeezi* (masc. sing) 'my dear', '*azeezti* (fem. sing) 'my dear', *jaar-ii*/*jaartii* (masc./fem. sing) 'my neighbor' and *qareebii* 'my relative'. Other intimate terms that are exclusively used among males include *shareeki* (masc./sing) 'my business partner' and *AbuShreek* (lit, father of a partner- masc. sing); two forms that are used as a very common mode of address among partners in a business. Another intimate form is the one used among in-laws addressing each other as *naseebi* (my brother or son in-law) or *abu-nasab* (lit. father of in-law relationship). In addition to their signaling intimacy or solidarity between interlocutors, these forms of address express certain types of relationships. These terms are mainly used between friends and close acquaintances or colleagues. With respect to social variables, the use of these terms includes significant sex differences, the most obvious of which is that the use of some of these terms is mainly correlated with the speaker's and addressee's sex. Males give and receive these terms to males more than female speakers do to female speakers. With the exception of the terms *jaar* "neighbor" and *Aziiz* "dear" which are used to by both male and female speakers to address male and female speakers, other forms are used by males to males and no counterpart forms for females are recorded or used. An interesting observation about the structure of these terms is adding the possessive pronoun *ii'-my'* to the term to add more emphasis on the degree of solidarity or intimacy that is conveyed by the address term itself.

Another interesting observation is that one of the frequent unexpected terms used as a solidarity form and occurred eight times in this study is the English word "man." The word *man* was observed to be commonly used among the young educated males who felt the need to assert their identity through identification with modernism and knowing English. Its Arabic equivalents *zalama and rajil*, on the other hand, are constantly and reciprocally used among middle-aged and older males. Also the principle of reciprocity and non-reciprocity guides the use of such appellations, as with other names. For example, a young educated male in his twenties will use the word *man* to address his friend but he will never use it to address an intimate acquaintance in his forties. By the same token older people will reciprocally use the Arabic *rajel* and *zalama "man"* to address their intimate acquaintance of the same age. The rule is that, in addition to their being used among close friends, terms of solidarity are also used among neighbors, relatives by marriage and acquaintances.

Besides nicknames and terms of solidarity, another form of the appellatives used as a mode of address in Palestinian Arabic is endearment or affection terms. These are mostly used in the familial domain to spouses and to one's own children and also to lovers, friends and to young children in general to express affection. The data recorded instances of endearment terms mainly used between couples and also among friends as *ħabebi* and *ħabibti* 'my beloved one', *ħayatii* and *ʕumri* 'my life', *ʕaini* "my eye", *ʕinaya* 'my eyes,' *nuur ʕaini* "light of my eye, *ruuhi* "my soul", *gaali* 'dear,' and *qalbi* 'my heart.' The term *ruuħ ʔummak (*f .ruuħ ʔummak) 'spirit of your mother' is used by mothers to their children as a term of affection. Interestingly, all of these forms are inflected for the possessive *my* which shows the intimate relationship between interlocutors in addition to the meanings inherited in each term.

The data also show that endearment terms were not limited to couples and friends but some of them are mainly used to address children. Some of the forms used to girls include *ħabiibti* 'my beloved', *ʔamoora* 'diminutive of *ʔamar* 'moon' to refer to a beautiful girl,'

ʔamar (lit. moon, to say that the girl is as beautiful as moon), *'ħelwa'* sweeti*e, ʕasal'* (*honey*) and *sukar* 'sugar.' The masculine forms of these endearment terms are used to young boys but these terms are more frequent in addressing girls. In addition to their being used as affection or endearment terms within the family, these three latter forms of *ħelwa* 'sweeti*e,' ʕasal* '*honey'* and *sukar* 'sugar' were used by young men as forms of teasing for young females in the street. These terms and others show that teasing activity in Palestinian Arabic tends to be playful and harmless.

Moreover, nonsense terms like *nuunu* 'little baby' are sometimes used as terms of affection to babies. However, the collected data are not enough to determine how widespread the use of endearment terms is for people other than couples and children among Palestinian speakers. The most common term that is used as affection term to both children and adults is *ħabiibi/ ħabibti* (masc. fem sing.) and *ħabaybi pl."*(my loved one). Over 12 instances of the use of these three forms occurred in the natural data, almost all of which involved use to intimate young addressees. Both older and younger speakers were involved. The terms are used to spouses, lovers, friends in the same sex and by older speakers to known or unknown children.

4.5.3 Teknonyms

Braun (1988) mentioned that there are nominal forms of address which define an addressee as a father, a brother, a wife, or a daughter of someone else by expressing the addressee's relation to another person. Such forms include the Arabic *ʔabu flaan* 'father of so and so', *bint fulaan* "daughter of so and so' with *fulaan* being replaced by the given name of the oldest son if there are sons or by the name of the oldest daughter if there are no sons. In his examination of Egyptian Arabic terms of address system, Parkinson (1985) termed these forms of address as teknonyms that are very frequent forms of address in Arab communities. This observation is supported by the fact that 231 instances of these teknonyms occurred in the

present study which shows that these forms are very pervasive in the Palestinian community. Though examples of addressing a boy and a girl as the son and daughter of someone and addressing a woman as the wife of someone using her husband's name occurred in the data, these patterns are not a common social norm or practice for address behavior in the Palestinian community. However, the most frequent form is addressing a man or a woman as being the father or mother of someone. The data indicate that every Palestinian who is a parent may also be referred to and addressed by the terms *ʔabu fulaan* 'father of so and so' or *ʔum fulaan* 'mother of so and so,' with *fulaan* being replaced by the name of the oldest son if there are sons, or if there are no sons, by the name of the oldest daughter. With respect to the syntax of these forms, these forms act like names, i.e. they can occur alone or with other terms of address.

Parkinson (1985, p.58) notes that this teknonymic custom is very deeply embedded into traditional Arab culture in which "great value is ascribed to the act of producing sons." Thus, traditionally, teknonyms are terms of respect, or even terms acknowledging achievement, and any father or mother would have expected to receive them, both from each other, and in general from relatives, friends, neighbors, local shopkeepers, etc. Interestingly, the data of this study even show that these terms in Palestinian Arabic are used as terms of respect to address old people who may not have kids but are old enough to have children. So it is common for close relatives, friends and acquaintances to address an old couple who do not have children using a teknonym of *ʔabu or ʔam fulaan* "father or mother of so and so" where *fulaan* stands for the name that couple wish to pick for their child had they had one. Some other people may receive a teknonym consisting of *ʔabu* 'father of" plus the name of the man's father since many Palestinians tend to name their first son after the grandfather's name. By the same token, the wife will receive the teknonym *ʔam fulaan* 'mother of so and so.' It is to be noted that while the teknonym *ʔabu fulaan* 'father of so and so' is used by all speakers

with no special constraints, the teknonym ‘mother of so and so’ has three variants that are associated with the speaker’s sociolinguistic background. According to Braun (1988, p.180), it seems reasonable to treat such forms as distinct variants each, because of the different connotations and social meanings associated with standard language and spoken dialects. In Palestinian Arabic, the teknonymic variant *ʔam fulaan* is used exclusively by rural speakers while the variant *ʔim fulaan* is used exclusively by urban speakers. The standard variant *ʔum fulaan* is much less frequent than the two dialectal or colloquial forms but it is still used by highly-educated speakers. This variation supports Braun’s (1984) claim that certain variants are preferred by certain groups of speakers who are characterized in terms of regional dialect, urban vs. rural background, degree of education, age, and so forth.

Unlike what Parkinson (1985) found about Egyptian Arabic where a change in the traditional values among the upper classes had made usage of teknonyms more and more restricted to working-class addressees, the 231 examples of teknonyms collected in the present data show that this form is very active among all people in the Palestinian community. The data show that teknonyms are used equally among urban and rural speakers, to both women and men, to educated and uneducated people and to occupants of high status occupations as well as working-class jobs. With respect to the degree of acquaintanceship, the data show that these forms are used among relatives, friends, acquaintances, colleagues and people who are slightly acquainted with each other. This form of address expresses familiarity and respect at the same time. However, the most significant factor that regulates the use of teknonyms in Palestinian Arabic is age. It is even considered shameful to address an old speaker who has a son with his first name.

Furthermore, a relevant observation about the use of teknonyms in Palestinian Arabic is that while names are the most common form of address for young acquaintances, the counterpart form for addressing middle-aged and old people is the use of teknonyms.

However, the data show that the use of a name or a teknonym versus a title or a term of address that signals the addressee's occupational and/or educational rank is governed by the context. For example, two intimate female teachers who work in the same school make use of both the first personal name and teknonym to address each other in all occasions. However, when it happens that they address each other in front of other students or students' parents, they switch to the formal form of using the respectful term *sitt* 'Mrs.' plus the first name as a way of showing respect to each other in front of other persons adding more formality to the setting.

In addition, other examples from the data also give further evidence to the observation that the use of teknonyms versus other forms of address where all can be appropriate is dependent on the factors of relationship between interlocutors, formality of context, the speaker's educational and/or occupational rank as well as the speaker's social background. There is an example of a school principal who received the term *sitt*/Mrs. from some students' mothers at school, yet in family domain and gatherings; the principal is addressed by the same speakers, who are a part of the same social network, as *ʔam fulaan* where fulaan stands for the name of her oldest son. This is a good example to see how speakers view two different forms of address to be equally respectful but using one rather than the other is governed by the setting or context. By using the term *Sitt* 'Mrs.' to address the school principal, the speakers acknowledge the respect that the school principal deserves for her educational and occupational rank. However, the use of the teknonymous form of *ʔum fulaan* shows respect to her as a mother. It is to be noted that this usage is still a tendency and not an absolute as some variation exists from a speaker to another. For example, the speaker's background and the address norms s/he uses can also play a role in the choice of a teknonym from among other forms which are all acceptable. For instance, the data show that young female speakers with rural background frequently use a teknonym '*mother of so and so'* to address their neighbor

who is as old as their mothers, while a young female urban speaker would extend the kinship term *xaltu* ‘mother’s sister’ to address their neighbor or mother’s friend. This indicates that the choice of a certain address term versus the other is governed by general norms of address employed by the community in addition to some individual practices that may vary from a speaker to another.

A final observation about the use of teknonyms that is supported by six examples from the data is the fictive use of teknonyms among younger friends to address each other. Young friends who are not even married or do not have sons, use the construction *ʔabu* plus the addressee’s first name, or a form derived from it, i.e. *ʔabu Salaah* to address a friend named *Salah* or *ʔabu Hmaid* to an addressee named *Ahmad*. These forms, which function as intimate playful nicknames are exclusively used among male friends.

Other additional types of teknonyms that occurred in the data include addressing someone as the son of his father using *ya ʔibn fulaan* ‘the son of so and so’ where *fulaan* is replaced by the father’s name. Only seven instances on the usage of this form occurred in the data which makes it difficult to determine the exact factors that govern this usage. However, similar to the usage of *ʔabu fulaan* ‘father of so and so,’ the use of *ʔibn fulaan* ‘son of so and so’ is mainly governed by age. Unlike *ʔabu fulaan* which is more likely to be used to old addressees, this later form is used exclusively to youngsters from their friends and age mates and from speakers who are more superior in terms of age and rank as well. The natural data also show that the form *son of so and so* was only used from male speakers to male addressees. Interestingly, no instances occurred where someone is addressed as the *son of plus the name of his mother* because the Palestinian community is a traditional conservative society where it is considered very rude and insolent to call one by his mother’s name. A third less frequent interesting usage of teknonyms is the use of the form *mart fulaan* ‘wife of so and so’ where *fulaan* stands for the name of the husband. This form occurred only four times in a rural

uneducated family who made frequent use of this form to address their daughters and sisters-in-law. All of the addressees are young in age and received the term from older speakers e.g. father and mother-in-law in addition to receiving it from speakers of their age e.g., sisters-in-law.

To summarize the use of teknonyms, a thorough examination of the data on teknonyms shows that teknonyms *ʔabu fullan* and *ʔam/ʔim fulaan* 'father of so and so and mother of so and so' are very commonly used among spouses, relatives, friends, neighbors, colleagues at work, acquaintances, etc. These two forms represent more than 92% of the overall 231 teknonyms that occurred in the data. Also, the data gathered indicate no particular speaker-related constrains, and a very strong tendency for the forms to be restricted to middle aged and old addressees regardless of their occupational or educational rank or the dialect they speak. Interestingly, unlike the name alone which is governed by degree of acquaintanceship, there appears to be no constraint against using the teknonyms to an addressee as long as they are much older than the speaker. Although teknonyms are considered to be names, they also imply a certain amount of respect. On the other hand, they are also common between intimate friends, which indicates that they do not necessarily mark *kulfa* 'formality.' Unlike other terms of respect, they are used both to intimate and non-intimate addressees. The main implication of this wide usage of teknonyms is that Palestinian speakers with different backgrounds draw upon these forms to address their interlocutors to show the human respect due to an old parent.

4.5.4 Kinship/Family Terms

4.5.4.1 Introduction

According to Braun (1988), kinship terms (KT) are terms for blood relations and for affines. The extended family system in Arab culture, in general, and among Palestinian speakers, in particular, is associated with a wide array of kinship terms which indicate the family relationships among individuals. This category of family terms includes all those terms

whose referential meanings refer to a relative of speaker, regardless of whether or not in any one instance the term is actually being used to a relative of speaker. The kinship/family terms category is the second largest one after names with respect to the number of instances gathered under this category. The family terms collected by field researchers in this study include 296 terms. The frequent occurrence of these terms in the data is due to the fact that all speakers constantly address their parents, children, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, grandparents, cousins, in-laws in addition to more distant relatives. As a general feature of addressing relatives, Parkinson (1985) notes that in all speech communities the rules for addressing relatives are strict. The present data show that these rules in Palestinian Arabic are variable, both for individual speakers and across the speech community, showing some interaction with other terms of address.

Before discussing the family address terms gathered by fieldworkers in this study in more detail, it is relevant here to point out some important features found to be characterizing the use of these kinship terms as address forms. A very interesting characteristic of the use of family terms by Palestinian speakers is what Braun (1988) referred to as address inversion; a special pattern of nominal address. According to Braun, address inversion is the use of a term, mostly a KT, which does not, as would be usual, express the addressee's but the speaker's role in the dyad, e.g., a mother addressing a child as *mama* or a father addressing his daughter as *baba.* Other examples of reverse addressing in the data occurred with the kinship terms *xaalah and* xaal 'maternal aunt and uncle,' *ʕammah* and *ʕamm* "paternal aunt and uncle" in addressing one's niece or nephew e.g. the aunt calls the niece as *ʕammti* 'auntie' where the usual form of address should be the niece's first name.

Also Braun (1988, p.12) notes that address inversion is not restricted to KTs because one may speak of inversion whenever a form of address contains semantic features applicable

to the speaker rather than the addressee. Kinship terms inversion**,** however, seems to be the most frequent type which is emphasized by the current study where most of the examples that involved address inversion occurred with kinship terms including terms for father, mother, aunt, uncle, grandfather and grandmother.

Another interesting addressing strategy used by Palestinian speakers as emphasized by data on kinship terms is an extended fictive use of family terms for non-relative addressees. With this strategy, by and large the use of family terms has been extended beyond its primary function to address someone who is not related to the speaker in one way or other. The kinship terms have been extended beyond their primary use, in that address terms for father, mother, siblings, aunt, uncle and grandparents do not necessarily correspond to the biological kin with the addressee. The data show that persons with whom there is no definite relationship are addressed as *ʕam or xhaal* 'uncle' or *ʕamma/xaala* 'aunt' and in very few instances as *ʔaba* 'father' or *ʔama* 'mother' if they are approximately as old as one's parents. The use of 'uncle' and 'aunt' to address persons with whom there is no definite relationship, but are approximately as old as one's parents, is not significantly restricted by constraints other than age as it is used by both males and females, educated and uneducated and urban and rural speakers to males and females, educated and uneducated as well as urban and rural addressees. Though the terms for 'aunt' and 'uncle' were extended by all speakers to address an older person who is not biologically kin to the speaker, using the terms for father and mother to address people as old as one's parents' was only observed among uneducated rural young male salespersons, vendors, drivers, etc in addressing old customers of their parents' age in popular markets and streets. Another difference between speakers in the use of kinship terms is a phonological difference as the forms used by urban speakers differ phonologically from the forms used by rural speakers as will be indicated later.

The following is an example of how kinship terms are extended to address people other than one's relatives:

- Salamu ʕalai-k-um, xala, kaif hal-kum?

  Peace upon you, aunt, how are you (pl.)?

In the above example, the speaker addresses her mother's friend with *xala* 'maternal *aunt*' though she is not her relative. Yet she does this out of respect and politeness. In addition, she addresses her in the plural using the inflected plural second person pronoun 'kum.' In Arabic culture, this is a politeness strategy that is required by young speakers when they address an elder. This example illustrates how the use of kinship terms is commonly extended to address elders regardless of biological relationship, social class or gender with age as the main determining factor. The data show other examples where a young driver and a young storekeeper address male customers using the term *ʕam* 'uncle' or ʔa*buya* 'father' and an elderly female using the term *xala* 'aunt.' The main implication of this extended or fictive use of family terms to non-relatives is that the bigger the age gap between participants, the more respect the younger person shows in the way s/he addresses an older person.

Also, a significant observation about the fictive use of kinship terms to address non relatives is that these family address forms, when referring to people with whom there is some kind of biological relationship, tend to occur with the possessive "my" e.g. "my uncle, my aunt" but those with whom there is no such relationship may occur with or without the possessive. It is also noted that these kinship terms along with teknonyms discussed above are used in complementation with personal names. Rather than addressing an older person by their personal name, a younger person will choose a kinship term or a teknonym.

In addition, the extended or fictive use of kinship terms is not only restricted to addressing older people but is also extended to address kids and youth. For instance, if names are not known, then kinship terms are again employed; e.g., a much older person may address a young male or female as *ʔibnaya* "my son" or *binti* "my daughter." For example, the data show that it is common for elderly women to address younger male interlocutors, with or without any definite relationship, as *ʔibnayeh* 'my son'. This type of address is intended to evoke a sense of solidarity from the addressee. Also females were reported to use the term *ʔax* 'brother' without the possessive 'my,' for example, to address an unknown male of their age or older in school, public places and street to ask for help or about directions, for example. Males were reported to use *ya ʔuxt* "sister" to address young females of their age in public places. Using the simple *ax* 'brother' and *ʔuxt* 'sister' rather than the more intimate forms *ax-i* 'my brother' and *ʔuxt-i* 'my sister' is significant and meaningful between strangers since the use of *ʔax* and *ʔuxt* is more appropriate to show distance between unknown interlocutors especially those of opposite sex. Of course this usage is only one form and many other options are available. For example, a young female may also receive the address term *ʔanessa* "Miss" from unknown speaker. So the choice from among several variants depends on the norms and repertory of address terms employed by each speaker and the context of conversation.

Another remarkable observation is that a fictive use of a kinship term may be accompanied by address inversion. The data show examples where a senior male unknown to the speaker was addressed as *ʕammi* 'my uncle' and an old woman was addressed as *xaala 'aunt.'* By means of inversion, the same terms of ʕ*ammi* or *xaala* were reciprocated from the senior addressees to the junior speakers. As noted earlier, this tendency to address known and unknown people with whom there is no biological kin using family terms is observed to be used by all speakers with no constraint. The main difference to be found is between the variants used by urban speakers and the ones used by rural speakers. This means that when

they address a relative, individual speakers not only mark the relationship existing between themselves and addressees, but often mark their own and addressee's linguistic and social background. Following from this introduction on how kinship terms are consistently used as very pervasive forms of address by Palestinian speakers, the following section will discuss individual categories of family address terms in more detail.

4.5.4.2 Addressing Fathers and Mothers

In addressing their fathers, Palestinian speakers draw on a number of terms that all can be used to address a father. The terms gathered in the data include *baaba, ya'aba* 'contraction of vocative particle ya with *ʕaaba*,' *ʕabuuya and daadi* with *baaba* and *ya'aba* as the most frequent and *ʕabuuya and daadi* much less commonly used. The term *baaba* is mainly used by urban speakers who live in the city and some rural children whose parents occupy high educational and/or occupational rank. The form *ya'aba* is mainly used by rural speakers and by urban male speakers older than 17 years old especially in the presence of non-family because the form *ya'aba* is thought to express some roughness or coarseness and hence a sense of masculinity and manliness. This is also one of the reasons why female speakers- especially those with urban background- make more use of use the form *baaba* while males make more use of the form *ya'aba.* The form *ʕabuya*, on the other hand, occurred only 5 times in the natural data and it is exclusively used by rural and Bedouin uneducated speakers to address their fathers. In contrast, the form *daadi*, which only occurred 3 times in the data, is used by children who are students in private schools where English is spoken. However, the form *baaba*, which occurred 27 times in the data (with a percent of 10% 0f the overall family terms), and the form *ya'aba*, which occurred 35 times in the data (12% of the total family terms), are by far the most common.

In addition to the address terms discussed above, the natural data include examples of other terms used by Palestinian speakers to address fathers. The most frequent of these terms is using the term *haj* 'pilgrim' by daughters and sons to address their father when he gets older, and certainly if he has actually undertaken the pilgrimage to Mecca. Though not very common, in educated families in which the father is not very strict, children may occasionally be heard addressing their father with his first name or a nickname, often playfully, or when trying to persuade him to do something for them. Also in these families where the father is not strict, two examples in the natural data show that children used *ʕaxuuya* 'my brother' to address their father during arguments. However, the *baaba* and *ya'aba* terms are clearly much more common than any of these other address terms that are used to fathers.

The set of terms used to mothers is parallel in many ways to those used to fathers. These forms include *maama, ya'amma* 'contraction of vocative particle ya with *ʕamma*,' *and maami*. These three forms appear to be parallel to the forms *baaba, ya'aba and daadi* in that *maama* is used by urban speakers and children of some educated rural speakers while *ya'amma* is mainly used by rural speakers. Similar to *daadi, maami*, of which there are only two instances in the data, is used by children who go to private schools where English is spoken or who spent some time in an English-speaking country. A fourth form that is used to address mothers is the Standard Arabic form *ʕummi:* 'my mother' which is used by some highly-educated speakers who tend to switch to the standard form in their daily life interaction. Moreover, similar to older fathers, older mothers are often addressed with a respectful *hajje* 'pilgrim,' particularly if the mother has actually gone on a pilgrimage to Mecca. Also children and teenagers may use *ʕaxti* 'my sister' to their mothers in arguing with her or when they are not happy with something their mother did to them, parallel to the use of *ʕaxuuya* to fathers. The data also include 3 instances where children addressed their mother by her first name playfully to tease her. However, the *maama* (with 23 examples in the data- 8%) and *ya'amma*

(29 examples- about 10%) terms are much more common than any of these other terms that are used to address mothers.

4.4.4.2 Addressing Sons and Daughters

In addressing their sons and daughters, Palestinian parents have a somewhat wider range of choices of terms for their children than their children have for them. These options include names, nicknames, endearment and affection terms in addition to the kinship terms they use to refer to them in the third person e.g. *ʔibni/ʔibnaya* 'my son', *binti/ ʔibnayti* 'my daughter' and the words wala 'boy', walek 'girl' in addition to the reverse use of the terms *baaba, ya'aba* from a father and *maama, ya'ama* from a mother, and several other forms. However, the natural data show that the most common form is using a first name by a parent to a son or a daughter regardless of their age. Nicknames are also used but they are mainly used to children and younger sons and daughters. Another interesting observation is using the teknonym *father* and *mother of so and so* by parents to address their married middle-aged and older daughters and sons. This is especially the case in front of other people to show respect to them as parents.

Also, Palestinian speakers use the terms *ʔibni* 'my son' and *binti* 'my daughter' to refer to one's child in conversation with a third person. However, these terms are also used to address one's child in face-to-face interaction. The eleven examples on the use of *ʔibni* and *binti* to actual sons and daughters show that the use of these forms is not restricted by particular social constraints. Parents of all varieties and backgrounds use the terms in general conversation with their son and daughter with the purpose giving advice or orders sometimes.

In addition to the above options Palestinian parents make in addressing their children, another important worth mentioning strategy, referred to earlier in this paper and commonly

used by Palestinian speakers in addressing daughters and sons, involves what Braun (1988) referred to as address inversion or what Ayoub (1962) has called bipolarity i.e. the use of the term to the child that it would be appropriate for the child to use in addressing the speaker. In examining address forms in a village in Lebanon, Ayoub (1962) found that it is common for almost any relative of a child to address the child with the address term the child would normally use to address him. This usage includes at least parents, paternal uncles and aunts, maternal uncles and aunts and grandparents. Natural data of the present study include eighty seven instances of this later usage (about 30% of the overall kinship terms in this study) which gives a strong evidence that the same pattern of bipolarity found to be existing in Lebanon exists almost the same way among Palestinian speakers in Gaza in that parents, uncles, aunts and grandparents address children with the term that defines them as a speaker, i.e., the term that the child would normally use to address them. This pattern in both Lebanese and Palestinian Arabic is different from the usage Parkinson (1985) found in Egyptian Arabic where the general pattern among Egyptian speakers is for all of these classes of relatives, especially parents, to use the term *baaba* 'father' for both sons and daughters. Parkinson also found that mothers and aunts much more rarely could use *maama,* but only for daughters, with *baaba* being much more common to both sexes. He also found that the use of terms like *xalti. ʻammti* 'my maternal/paternal aunt' and *xali/ʻammi* 'my maternal/paternal uncle,' which are commonly used by Palestinian speakers to address one's nephews and nieces, is apparently non-existent in Egyptian Arabic.

In the present study, 26 examples of the use of *baaba* and ya*ʻaba* 'father' and 19 examples of *maama* and ya*ʻama* 'mother' to address speaker's sons and daughters appeared in the natural data. This strategy is used by both urban and rural speakers and by educated and uneducated speakers to both males and females. The use is not restricted to young children but also used to old and middle-aged sons and daughters. Other forms that show bipolarity in

Palestinian address system include *xaal* ‘maternal uncle’ and *‘am* ‘paternal uncle’, of which there are 12 instances in the data used by an uncle to address a nephew or a niece. Also the family terms *xaala* ‘maternal aunt’ and *‘ama* ‘paternal aunt’ occurred 13 times and were used by an aunt to address a nephew or a niece. Similarly, the terms *siid-i* ‘my grandfather’ and *sitt-i* ‘my grandmother’ occurred 17 times in the data as forms used to address grandsons and granddaughters.

Other address forms that are actively used by Palestinian parents to address their children include the terms *walad* ‘boy’ and *‘bint’* ‘girl’ and their other variants including *wala ‘boy’* and walek ‘you, girl”. Besides being the most common terms used to small children in general, these latter forms are also commonly used to one’s own children. However, their use is most often accompanied by an order to one’s son or daughter to do or stop doing something and sometimes they are said with a rather sharp tone of voice. These forms are used by all speakers and do not show any social constraints of being used by any particular speakers, but all of them are used to young addressees.

As a rich system of address forms, Palestinian speakers also have many other terms that they can commonly draw upon to address their children including terms of endearment that were discussed earlier in this study in addition to many other abusive terms that are also used both playfully and angrily in the same way they are used to any other addressee.

4.5.4.4 Addressing Brothers and Sisters

In communication between siblings, reciprocal personal name is the rule among Palestinian speakers. As a general rule, brothers and sisters are addressed by their names or nicknames. Abusive terms, playful terms, and *wala* ‘boy’ and *walek* ‘girl’ are also extremely common, especially but not exclusively to younger brothers and sisters. Also if there is a

difference of 15 years old or more between brothers and sisters and one of them is married and have children, the younger sibling addresses the older using a teknonym *ʻabu fulaan* ʻfather of plus the name of their oldest son' while the younger sibling is addressed by personal name or nickname. Also middle-aged and older siblings tend to use these teknonyms reciprocally if they are married and have children. Moreover, the natural data include seven instances of using the kinship term *ʔaxuya* ʻmy brother' that defines the addressee as a brother and its female counterpart *ʔaxtii* ʻmy sister' which define the addressee as a sister. In the present study, these forms are used among middle-aged and older speakers to show solidarity with their siblings. Five other instances of the terms *ʔaxii* and *ʔaxtii* occurred in the data. These instances were used by young speakers to address their young siblings. This latter usage was accompanied by a sharp tone and it implied that the speaker is annoyed with the addressee. This use can also occur among non-siblings, but no instances were recorded.

4.5.4.5 Addressing Spouses

In addressing their spouses, Palestinian speakers draw on personal names and other address forms. The usual address form between husband and wife is the reciprocal exchange of personal name. Thus the husband addresses his wife by her personal or nickname names; in return she addresses him using the first name or in a number of other ways, some of which may even have an amount of flattery. Endearment terms like *habiibi* (f.), *habiibti* (M.) ʻmy beloved one,' *ʔomr*i and *hayati* ʻmy life' and other forms may be used. But these endearment terms are mainly used between spouses in privacy while they tend to be more formal in front of other members of the family making use of personal names. In another common pattern, middle-aged spouses put themselves on a mutual level of respect only for the purposes of address, especially in front of traditional people. In this case, the couple uses a teknonymous mode of address; i.e., they call each other by the name of their first-born child. The husband

addresses his wife as ‘mother of *fulaan*’ where *fulaan* is replaced by the son’s name, and the wife does the same.

In addition to using teknonyms, older spouses tend to make reciprocal use of the term *haj/hajje* ‘pilgrim’ to address each other if they have undertaken the pilgrimage to Mecca, especially in front of other people. Other interesting but less frequent forms that were recorded in the data is the occurrence of the terms *marat-i* “my wife” and *joaz-i* ‘my husband’ six times in the data among rural and uneducated spouses to address each other. Another form that was found to self-represent the speaker as uneducated in the way he addresses his wife is the use of the term *ya marra* ‘you woman.’ This use is often associated with a sharp tone of annoyance with what a wife did or for not responding to her husband.

4.5.4.6 Addressing Uncles and Aunts

The Arab kinship system makes a distinction between maternal and paternal relatives and between “real” relatives and relatives by marriage. The terms and their phonological variants used to refer to the various types of uncles and aunts are summarized in table 6.

Table 6: The different terms for aunts and uncles in Palestinian Arabic

Term	**Gloss**
ʕamm-i/ ʕammo	My paternal uncle (Father’s Brother)
ʕamt-i/ ʕamto	My paternal aunt (Father’s sister)
Xaal-i/xaalo	My maternal uncle (mother’s brother)
Xalt-i/xalto	My maternal aunt (mother’s sister)
Mart ʕamm-i	My paternal uncle’s wife
Joaz ʕammt-i	My paternal aunt’s husband
Mart xaal-i	My maternal uncle’s wife
Joaz xalt-i	My maternal aunt’s husband

Data of the present study included about thirty eight instances of using these terms to actual relatives (about 13% of the overall kinship terms). The data collected on the interlocutors' characteristics also show that there are no restrictions on the use of these terms by some speakers rather than others. However, the main difference is that all variants used by urban speakers, especially females and young speakers, tend to end with the vowel /o/ as opposed to the vowel /i/ in variant forms used by rural speakers and some older urban male speakers. So the way they pronounce kinship terms of addressing uncles and aunts, the speakers render themselves as urban or rural speakers.

Thirteen instances of *ʕammi/ ʕammo* to real ʕ*am* 'paternal uncle' were recorded as used by speakers of different backgrounds, nine instances of *xaali*/*xaalo* to a real *xaal* 'maternal uncle', nine instances or cases of *ʕamti/'amto* to a real *ʕamma* 'aunt' and seven instances of *xaalti/xaalto* to a real *xaala* 'aunt/mother's sister.' All of the other usage of these terms appear in the corpus only in extended usage, not to real uncles and aunts. As mentioned earlier the word *ʕam* 'uncle' is used to address known and unknown older people of one's father's age. An interesting observation is that in addressing known older males who are distant relatives to the speaker, the speakers make a distinction between distant relatives from father's side addressing them as *ʕam* 'father's brother' and those from mother's side addressing them as *xaal*/mother's brother. In addressing mother's and father's sister's husband, urban speakers tend to use *ʕammi*/uncle if the addressee is much older than the speaker or a teknonym *father of plus older son's name* if they are close in age while the rural speakers tend to use a teknonym regardless of any age difference. The same applies to addressing maternal and paternal uncles' wives who are addressed by *xaalto* 'my mother's sister' by urban speakers if the addressee is much older than the speaker or by first name or a teknonym if they are close in age while rural speakers tend to use first name if they are close in age or a teknonym if the addressee is much older than the speaker.

4.5.4.7 Addressing Cousins

With respect to addressing cousins in the Palestinian community, the data show that speakers tend to address cousins exactly the same way they address brothers and sisters. Using the first name is the common usual form but other forms are also available. For example, a cousin who is as old as one's parents may potentially be addressed as *ʕammi* 'father's uncle.' Also middle-aged and older cousins tend to address each other using teknonyms reciprocally. An interesting pattern that occurred six times in the data is the reciprocal use of *ʔibn ʕammi* 'my uncle's son' and *bint ʕammi* 'my uncle's daughter' between cousins showing solidarity in the way they address each other. These latter forms are used by male speakers addressing their female cousins or vice versa to show solidarity and at the same time avoid using the first name. By using these terms, interlocutors emphasize their solidarity due to the blood relation that exists between them as cousins.

4.5.4.8 Addressing Grandparents

Palestinian speakers address their paternal grandparents as well as their maternal grandparents using the terms *siidi* 'my father's/ mother's father' and *sitti* 'my 'father's/ mother's mother' with no constraints on this use. However, the urban speakers tend to use the variants *siido* and sitto which distinguishes them as urban speakers. The data also show that children of educated speakers may refer to their grandparents using the standard Arabic terms *jiddi* 'my grandfather' and *jidditi* 'my grandmother.' Another possible term is *taita* which occurred in the data five times and is used by urban young speakers to address their mother's mother. This latter use reflects an Egyptian influence from drama and movies.

4.5.4.9 Addressing Fathers/Mothers-in-law and Brothers/Sisters-in-law

In Palestinian Arabic, fathers-in-law are almost always addressed as *ʕammi* 'uncle- my father's brother' by speakers of all classes. However, rural and urban speakers address their mothers-in-law using different terms. While, the term *ʕamtii* 'aunt- my father's sister' is used by rural speakers to address their mothers-in-law, urban speakers exclusively use the term *mart ʕamii* 'my paternal uncle's wife' to address their mothers-in-law. The term *xalti* and its variant *xaaltu* 'my mother's sister' are less frequently used to address mothers-in-law. Two examples occurred where an urban educated daughter-in-law used the term *maama* 'mother' to address her mother-in-law and show more solidarity with her. While rural female speakers use the kinship term *ʕamtii* 'aunt' which is also used by their male counterparts to address their mothers-in-law, the data have five examples where a teknonym was used by a male rural speaker to address their mother-in-law using the term *ʔam fulaan* 'mother of so and so' while no female rural speaker addressed her mother-in-law using a teknonym. Brothers and sisters-in-law are addressed by first name in all classes. But once children have come along, speakers tend to address their sisters and brothers-in-law especially older ones using a teknonym. An interesting example that occurred once in the data is using the kinship term *selfetii* 'my sister-in-law' by one rural uneducated speaker to address her sister-in-law. Also four examples occurred where a rural uneducated family used the term *mart fulaan* 'the wife of so and so" to address their daughters-in-law. Though these two latter uses are not a common practice in the Palestinian community and they were the only examples recorded, this usage shows that individual speakers draw upon their own norms in addressing others and that the choice of some address forms represent or reflect certain characteristics about the speakers' background in addition to the addressees.

The above discussion draws the picture of family/kinship terms in Palestinian Arabic which are the second most frequently occurring address terms in the entire corpus of this study. The use of these kinship terms shows different patterns where the first name is used to any relative of the same age/generation or younger. Another pattern is the use of a kinship term of respect with or without the first name to older relatives and the in-law relatives. Another main feature of kinship terms in Palestinian Arabic is that regardless of who uses them and for whom; kinship terms evoke a sense of solidarity among interlocutors. Solidarity in terms of Brown & Gilman's model implies equality between interlocutors, and is inherently reciprocal. But this does not seem to be the case in kinship term address among Palestinian speakers. Although solidarity is shown by the use of kinship terms, it does not eliminate the power of the older speaker over a younger addressee. Therefore, solidarity does not necessarily imply equality in terms of Brown & Gilman's model; and some kinship terms used in addressing people are neutral with regard to power.

Moreover, the above analysis has shown that while a few of the terms are often limited in address to the actual relative that the term names such as the terms ʕ*amti* 'father's sister', *sedi* 'grandfather' and *sitti* 'grandmother, most of other kinship terms i.e. ʕ*am* 'father's brother,' *xaala* 'mother's sister,' ʔ*ax* 'brother,' ʔ*uxt* 'sister,' ʔ*ibnaya* 'my son,' and ʔ*ibnayti* 'my daughter' are extended fairly broadly to a wide set of other addressees. With this fictive or extended use of family terms, the term for aunt/mother's sister was extended mainly to women who were the same age of one's real aunt which entails her respect on the part of the speaker. By the same token, terms for 'my son' and 'my daughter' were extended by older people to addressees the age of their real sons and daughters, often in the fatherly context of giving helpful advice, requesting help or thanking. The term for 'brother' was extended in solidarity to strangers of one's age and social class.

Similar to what Parkinson (1985) noted about Egyptian Arabic, this widespread extended use of kinship terms may be tempting to suggest that Palestinian speakers tend "to see their relationships with the people around them in terms of their family relationships" (p.116). It is interesting here to compare this finding about family address terms in Arabic with what Brown and Ford (1961) found about American English. While family address terms are of the most frequent address terms that Palestinian interlocutors employ in addressing each other, these kinship terms, according to Brown & Ford, "constitute a restricted language of relationship because most dyads that might be created in America would not call for any sort of kinship term" (p.375).

4.5.5 Occupation-Related Address Terms

Parkinson (1985, p.119) defines the occupation or work-related term of address as the one that a person receives or earns because of the degree he holds or because of the occupation he is engaged in. This applies both to occupations that are traditionally performed by highly-educated persons and to those that are more normally associated with the working class.

These occupation-bound terms are very common in Palestinian address system which is evidenced by the occurrence of 213 instances of these terms in the natural data. With respect to how they are used as address terms, the data show that one could address his or her recipient by: 1) job title only e.g. *doktoor* 'doctor', *baash mohandes* 'engineer', *ʔustaaz* 'professor', *modiirr* 'boss/manager' 2) a combination of job title and first name, e.g, *doktoor* Mohammed, *ʔustaaz* Khaled, *el muhandes* maher, etc. Working class jobs involve occupations such as *sabaak* 'plumber,' *najaar* 'carpenter,' *sawaq or chauffeur* 'driver', *bayaaʕ* 'salesman' and *bawaab* 'custodian,' etc. However, a main difference to be found between occupations of highly-educated persons and those of working class with respect to address behavior among Palestinian speakers is that while it is the norm to use an occupation title with or without a

name to show respect to an educated person, it is uncommon or inappropriate to address a driver, salesperson or custodian who is known to the speaker by his job as a practitioner of driving or selling. Rather it is more polite and respectful to address a working-class worker by first name if young or a teknonym or a kinship term if they are old. Table 7 presents the frequency/percent of each category of job-related terms followed by an explanation that deals with each of these categories individually.

Table 7: The frequency/percent of the different types of occupational terms of address

Category	**Frequency (%)**
Terms for highly prestigious jobs	16 (7.5)
The term *doktoor* for medical doctors & professors	33(14.5)
The term bashmuhandes	14 (6.8)
The term *ʻustaaz*	40(18.8)
Address Terms for female **t**eachers	90 /(42)
The term *m*ʕalemti	24/(11.2)
The term *Sitt*	37/(17.3)
The term ʔauntie	29/(13.6)
The term Sheikh	17/ (8)
Address terms for Working-class jobs	3/(1.4)
Total	213/ (100.0)

4.5.5.1 Addressing People of Highly Prestigious Jobs

The natural data involve sixteen examples of occupations of high prestige and dominance that have a double term of address that goes with them using the pattern of a first term of address followed by a definite second term of address "a first term of address+ the+ a second term of term" where the first term of address is usually one of the forms that were discussed with second person pronouns earlier and the usage of which is similar to *vous* pronouns in European languages with respect to power axis. These forms include the words *syadit* 'the dominance of', *ħaḏʿret* 'the presence of,' *saʕadet* and Maʕalii 'the Excellency of'

and *faḏilat* 'Excellency- used exclusively to Moslem Sheikhs.' The second term of address, on the other hand, is the name of the occupation or position that addressee occupies. Terms of address that fall within this category mainly involve high positions in the army, the police force, and the government. A list of those that appeared in the data is given in table 8. Items starred were recorded from television programs, while items not starred appeared also in the natural data.

Table 8: List of double Address Terms for highly prestigious jobs based on the pattern "a term of address followed by another definite term of address."

Army, Police Force Positions	**Gloss**
Siyadit illiwa	to a general
Siyadit ilʕaqiid	to a colonel
Government Positions	
*Siyadit irraʔiis	to the president
*Siyadit raʔiis ilwuzaraʔ	to the Prime Minister
Siyadit ilwaziir	to a minister
Maʕaali: ilwazi:r	to a minister
*Saʕadet issafi:r	to an ambassador
Other Positions	
Siyadit ilʕami:d	to a dean
ħaḏʿret el modeer	to a manager
Faḏilat ishsheix	to a Moslem sheikh

Addressees who occupy the positions listed above receive these terms of address from all types of speakers, especially the ones who work with them in the same workplace. These terms of address which are used up operate on Brown/Gilman's Power axis and are generally used as terms of respect and formality to an addressee who is higher on the power axis.

4.5.5.2 Using the Term *Doctor* to Address Physicians and Professors

One of the most highly prestigious jobs in the Palestinian community is that of a doctor. Unlike other occupational terms whose use may be extended to any educated-looking person, the terms d*oktoor* 'doctor' and *muhandes* 'engineer' are terms that must be earned, and their usage is not extended to any respectable-looking person unless the speaker knows that the addressee is really a doctor or an engineer. In the context of Palestinian society, the high prestige associated with this term of address is evident in that real doctors and Ph.D holders are on the top of the social hierarchy and are greatly respected and the fact that the prestige of medicine is also embedded into the educational system. Accordingly, the persons who earn the term must be shown respect in the way they are addressed.

More than any other occupation term, the terms *doctor* and *muhandes* 'engineer' are required from almost every type of speaker to addressees in the appropriate categories. The only exceptions are very close relatives i.e. parents, spouses, children, siblings, uncles and aunts, and very close friends in informal settings. Even in these cases, however, use of the term is quite common. It would be extremely rude and insolent not to use the term when it is expected to a person who deserves it.

The term *doktoor* 'doctor' is clearly a borrowed word, although it has been integrated rather well into the Palestinian system which evidenced by having a feminine form of the term '*doktoora'* in the same way feminine native Arabic words are derived. Though Arabic has two native words that are used to refer to doctors, *tabiib* and *hakim*, neither of these words is used in address. The terms *doktoor (masc.)* and *doktoora* (fem.) 'doctor' with or without names added are the only terms used to address doctors.

Thirty-three examples of *doktoor* usage appeared in the natural data. An examination of the data does reveal that speaker and addressee characteristics are not significant since being in the category of doctors is the main constraint that entails receiving the title from all

speakers. The only difference is that the variant *doktoor* and *doktoora* are used by urban speakers while the variants *daktoor* and *daktoora* are used by rural speakers. With respect to degree of acquaintanceship, known, slightly known and unknown addressees were equally likely to receive the term. Of course, only known addressees received *doktoor fulaan* with *fulaan* being replaced by the addressee's first name.

With respect to the type of persons who receive the term *doktoor* and *doktoora* in the Palestinian community, these terms are used to address any type of doctor. This includes medical doctors of all specializations, veterinarians, pharmacists, and anyone who has obtained a *doktoraah* 'a philosophy of doctorate' in any field whatsoever. The term is also extended sometimes to address graduate teaching assistants, and professors who have not yet obtained doctorates. For all of these categories of addresses, but especially for real doctors, the term is considered to have been earned, and it is realized by everyone in the community that these people deserve to receive it from every speaker who is aware that the addressee is a doctor.

Similar to what Parkinson (1985, p. 123) observed about the usage of the term *doktoor* in Egyptian Arabic, the prestige attached to the term *doktoor* in Palestinian Arabic is great that it therefore supersedes other terms that might otherwise apply and appear on the surface to be equally respectful. For example, in American English system, speakers can alternate between 'Professor' with the last name and 'Dr.' with the last name when referring to or addressing older professors, and neither term is preferred by addressees as more respectful than the other. In Palestinian and Egyptian Arabic as well, on the other hand, the word *ʔustaaz*, which means 'professor,' is rarely used to address or refer to professors because it is clearly considered to be cheaper or less respectable than *doktoor*, which is considered the only appropriate respectful term for addressing professors. In the present study, fifteen instances of the thirty three instances of the occurrence of the word *doktoor* were used to male and female medical

doctors. The other eighteen instances were used to address professors at university. Four of these instances were used to address female professors while the other fourteen were used to address male professors which could be traced back to the fact that the number of male professors in Palestinian universities is much larger than female professors.

Examples of the use of *doktoor* from the natural data include:

1- A patient's father asks the doctor about his son's condition.

   Aish ʔibnii ʕandu ya daktoor?

   What is my son suffering from, doctor?

2- The secretary greets a professor in the faculty of Arts at a local university in Gaza

   Sabah el khair ya doktoor Mahmoud!

   Good morning, doctor Mahmoud!

3- Hadad-et mawʕed el imtehaan wala lesa ya doktoor?

   Have you decided the schedule of the exam or not yet, doctor?

4.5.5.3 Addressing Engineers

Like *doktoor,* the address term *bashmuhandis* 'engineer,' which occurred fourteen times in the data, is one of the scientific terms of address; the right to receive which is earned by obtaining a degree in engineering. The word itself is a combination of the Turkish word *bash* 'chief' and the Arabic word *muhandid* 'engineer.' Any engineer, as long as he has a degree, deserves to receive this term from all speakers without any constraint. Though an engineer will normally receive a personal name or a teknonym from relatives and close friends, the address term *engineer* may be used occasionally even among close friends and in family settings.

All the occurrences of this term in the present study show that it is only used for real engineers without any extended usage. This finding is different from the occurrence of

bashmuhandis in Egyptian Arabic where Parkinson (1985) found that only12% of the forty-two instances of *bashmuhandid* use involved use to real engineers. In Egyptian Arabic, the term was more common as a general term of respect, extended by salesmen and service personnel to any respectable-looking addressee, and sometimes even to addressees who were not respectable-looking. For some reason in the present study, only three instances of the feminine form of *bashmuhandis* were used to address female speakers while other uses were for male speakers. This could be traced back to the larger number of male engineers in Gaza in comparison to females. Unlike *doktoor* and most of the other terms of respect, *bashmuhandis* is less likely to be used with the first name added, unless there are many engineers in the site, for example, and adding the name specifies on particular engineer. With respect to the degree of acquaintanceship between interlocutors, the term is equally likely to be used to both known and unknown addressees as far as the speaker is aware that the addressee is an engineer. The only exceptions are very close relatives and friends in informal situations, and even in these cases the term may occasionally be used. Examples where *engineer* is used as a term of address in the natural data include:

1- An administrative manager talked to an engineer in the company and asked him about the progress of a construction project

- Kaif el mashro' ya *bashmuhandis*.

  How is the project progressing, engineer?

2- A custodian in a company thanks an engineer for a favor he did for him.

- Shukran, ya bashmuhandis!

  Thank you, chief engineer!

4.5.5.4 The Term *ʔustaaz* 'Professor' as a Term of Address

Along with the terms *doktoor* and *bashmuhandes*, the term *ʔustaaz,* which occurred thirty six times in the data, completes the set of high earned terms of address in Palestinian Arabic. The term *ʔustaaz* literally means 'professor' 'lecturer' or 'master'. It is interesting to note, however, that 100 % of the instances of *ʔustaaz* usage in the natural data were to addressees other than professors. The data show that despite its use as a third person noun, the address term *ʔustaaz*, which can be used with and without the first name added, no longer means 'professor.' As mentioned earlier, the term *doctor* is exclusively used to address professors as it is considered much more respectful than *ʔustaaz*. Five of the instances where the term *ʔustaaz* occurred in the natural data were used to address college lecturers; two females and three males. Another eleven instances were used to white collar colleagues at university, ministries, and banks and even extended to unknown addressees in the street but who are respectful-looking, well dressed and appear to be having education or a degree. This later usage implies that the term *ʔustaaz* appears to mean something closer to 'educated' in Palestinian Arabic.

In addition to the above uses of the term *ʔustaaz,* this term with or without personal name is the only occupational address term used in Palestinian Arabic to address secondary and elementary school male teachers. The data include forty instances of this occurrence to address school principals and teachers. However**,** it is to be noted that the female variant *ʔustaaz-a* is not used to address secondary and elementary school female teachers who have their own address terms to be discussed later. The use of *ʔustaaz* to address male teachers has some interesting variations. For example, among themselves, female teachers use *ʔustaaz fulaan* almost exclusively to address male colleagues. Male teachers also use *ʔustaaz fulaan* among themselves with the first name alone being limited to close friends in non-public situations. All students generally address all male teachers with the term *ʔustaaz* by itself in

class and *ʔustaaz plus the first name* outside of class to get a teacher's attention, particularly if other teachers are around. The reasons for leaving off the name in class and adding it outside of class is that in class, there is only one high addressee around, the teacher, and there is no pragmatic function or purpose in adding the name. Outside of class, on the other hand, there are usually several teachers around or sitting together in the teachers' office, and when students come in to speak to one of them, using the name with the term distinguishes the addressee from other possible addressees. For example:

1- A student asks a teacher in the classroom to explain a point that he did not understand again

   Momken teshrah el noqta el axeera mara Tanya ya *ʔustaaz?*

   Could you explain the last point again, *professor?*

2- A student greets a teacher after coming back to school from Spring break.

   Kaif Halak ya *ʔustaaz Ahmad?*

   How are you, professor Ahmad?

Use of *ʔustaaz* or *ʔustaaz fulaan,* i.e. with the name added, is by far the most common term of address for elementary and secondary school teachers as well as to an addressee who is respectable-looking or looks like he could be a white collar employee. This includes use to office and school directors, government employees, school teachers and others. It is common to receive this term of address from inferiors, customers and students, but is equally common from colleagues, friends and relatives to addressees who deserve it. *ʔustaaz fulaan* was the most appropriate term for a school teacher or an educated colleague unless he was a close friend, in which case the first name alone would be used. Colleagues of the same age and rank, especially if not old, usually become close friends in short time where the term ʔ*ustaaz fulaan* would not be used for long and would be replaced by the first name. However, if the addressee is older or of a somewhat higher rank, and especially if he is of the opposite sex of speaker, the

ʔ*ustaaz fulaan* form would be retained throughout the relationship. This is also true with relatives and friends who are much younger and possibly of the opposite sex of addressee. However, the form would alternate with the first name alone with the latter being much more common in familial domain and among close friends. The plural of *ʔustaaz* is *ʔasadza* and it appeared four times in the natural data being used from a school principal to groups of elementary school teachers.

Examination of the data reveals that the speaker-related variables are not significant for *ʔustaaz* since all types of speakers use the term in about the same way. The addressee-related variables, which are significant, indicate that males are much more likely to receive *ʔustaaz* than females are to receive *ʔustaaza,* and that old and particularly middle aged addressees are the most likely to receive the term. If the interlocutors are strangers, the addressee must look educated, gentleman, and well-dressed in order to receive the term. Among known interlocutors, the addressee must have some kind of degree or to be working as a school teacher in order to receive *ʔustaaz*. Similar to other terms, the addressee will not receive the term from parents, wife, children, aunts, uncles and close friends in informal setting though in formal settings it is used reciprocally between friends and colleagues. In addition to showing respect, the form also serves as the formal way of talking to people when a formal relationship is present between interlocutors or the setting is very formal. In summary, the term *ʔustaaz* is most likely to be used as a general term of respect to address school teachers and any educated respectable-looking addressee. If addressee is known the name will likely be added using the form *ʔustaaz* f*ulaa*n with *fulaan* being replaced by the first name of the addressee.

4.5.5.5 Addressing Female Teachers

While the form *ʔustaaz* is used to address all male teachers and school principals with different backgrounds and characteristics, the natural data in this study show that there are more terms available for addressing female principals and teachers in elementary and secondary schools. The main distinction is to be made between students with rural background and those with urban background in the way they address their teachers. Rural students address their teachers using the term *mʕalemt-i* 'my teacher' in the classroom. The same term *mʕalemti* 'my teacher', of which there are twenty four instances in the data, and the form *sitt* 'Mrs.,' which occurred thirty seven times in the data, with the first name added are used in addressing the principal and teachers outside the classroom especially when other teaches are around.

Urban students, on the other hand, address their female teachers using the terms *sitt* 'Mrs.' and '*auntie* which is borrowed from the English *aunt*. This latter use of *auntie* seems to be characteristic of modern and westernized speakers, as opposed to traditional ones. In class it is used by itself, and outside of class it is fairly common to use *'auntie* with the first name to get the teacher's attention, particularly if other teachers are around. The forms *'auntie* and *'auntie plus the teacher's first name*, which occurred twenty nine times in the natural data, have come to be the most common term used by urban Palestinian students to address the principal and female teachers in elementary and secondary schools. There is no particular reason for these variations but a possible reason for using *'auntie* to address female teachers is to emphasize the friendly non-threatening aspects of the teacher-student relationship. This use could be explained by the idea that one's relationship to a female teacher should be marked by something like the mix of intimacy and respect that marks a typical relationship with their older aunt.

The school principal and teachers also use the term *sitt* 'Mrs.' or *'auntie* among themselves to address each other. If they are close friends, they will use first names without a term or title to address each other but in public situations in front of students or students' parents, the teachers will use the title *sitt* with the first name. In addressing the principal, the teachers may use the term *'auntie* or *sitt* 'Mrs.' to the head teacher who would reciprocally use the same terms to address teachers to show respect to them. Sometimes an old teacher may receive a teknonym from her intimate colleagues which also shows respect to her as an old mother. Though the relationship between interlocutors, their occupational rank and the formality of context are the main determinants of the way teachers address colleague teachers, the age is still an important factor here because, similar to other terms of address, the bigger the age gap between participants, the more respect the younger teacher shows when addressing the older colleague teacher.

Moreover, it is to be noted also that female teachers are addressed by the term *sitt* 'Mrs.' by neighbors, parents of their pupils and acquaintances who are aware that they work as teachers. However, in family settings and among very close friends, female teachers are addressed by their first name or a teknonym, for example.

Similar to kinship terms discussed earlier, a significant feature of the use of *ʔustaaz* 'professor,' *'auntie* and *mʕalemti* 'my teacher' to address school teachers is the address inversion. A teacher would be addressed as *ʔustaaz*, *'auntie* or *mʕalemti*. By means of inversion, the same term is reciprocated to the student. This usage lends support to what Braun (1988) mentioned that though address inversion mainly occurs with kinship terms with KT inversion being the most frequent type, it is not restricted to these terms. This study gives evidence that in addition to kinship terms, the Palestinian address system is characterized by address inversion with respect to the usage of occupation terms to address school male and

female teachers. In this latter situation, it is typical for a student to address his senior teacher using *ʔustaaz, 'auntie* or *mʕalemti* while the teacher would, in turn, address the student using the same term that defines him as a speaker rather than defining the addressee. Another implication of this phenomenon of address inversion is that the view of Brown & Gilman's (1960) reciprocity of address in a dyad i.e., exchange of the same variant, as a signal of equality and non-reciprocity, which has been interpreted as an expression of difference in age, status, or whatever, cannot be kept up when address inversion is concerned. Hence, according to Braun (1988), it has to be accepted that reciprocity of address can occur not only in spite of, but as an expression of, inequality. The concept of reciprocity, as it is normally understood, cannot be applied to inversion. Rather, inversion should be treated as "a special type of reciprocity" (p.294).

4.5.5.6 The Address Term *Sheikh*

The Arabic word sheikh literally means elder. In Islam, the word *sheix* normally refers to a man associated in one of various ways with a mosque. For example, a s*heikh* is the one who does the calls to prayer, leads prayers, gives religious counsel, teaches religious subjects, or recites the Quran. This term occurred seventeen times in the natural data. In some instances, sheikh is used alone and in other it occurred followed by a name "*sheix plus the first name"* to address Moslem sheikhs. This form of address is the most appropriate way to address the ʔ*imaam* 'prayer leader' of the mosque. It conveys politeness and respect for his position. The use of this term was extended from real sheikhs to anyone who is considered by people around him to be very religious i.e., a person who obeys all the rules of Islam and does his prayers at the mosque frequently. Interestingly, this extended use of *sheix* to persons viewed to be religious is more likely to be given to bearded men dressed in a traditional manner. Sheikhs receive this term from all speakers without any constraint on the usage. Unlike other terms

which may be replaced by first names in familial informal settings, sheikhs are also likely to receive this term from relatives, close friends, neighbors, acquaintances in addition to strangers as well. The term is thus a term of respect, but it does not necessarily imply the presence of formality in the relationship. As mentioned earlier, the combination *fadilit isheix* is used for highly educated sheikhs.

4.5.5.7 Address Terms for Working-class Occupations

Many work-related reference terms for working-class occupations exist in Palestinian Arabic; some are quite general and others are very specific as to occupation. However, not much natural data are available for job-related terms used to address hand craftsmen in face-to-face encounter e.g. electricians, plumbers, mechanics, carpenters, steelworkers, repairmen of all types, taxi, bus, horse and donkey cart drivers, salesmen, vendors, waiters, vegetable shop owners, etc. This could be traced back to the fact that it would be inappropriate to address a working-class employee using direct address referring to his job. People find it more respectable to address one by his first name or a teknonym to show respect to him. So either a pronoun or a verb form of address is used if the addressee is not known to the speaker or a first name is used to a young addressee and a teknonym to an older addressee if they are known to the speaker. Three instances of using terms to address young working-class occupations occurred in the data. A taxi driver was addressed by the word '*chauffeur*' from riders who were waiting in the taxi for him to come while he was buying something from a nearby shop in the street. The other two examples were used from children to a vendor in the street to stop him to buy ice-cream.

4.5.6 Terms of Formality and General Address Terms of Respect

These terms of formality or honorifics are used by a speaker to show respect and express deference to the addressee. Palestinian speakers make use of numerous types of these expressions in order to honor or dignify the addressed person. Such terms may be used in several forms: with or without the name of the addressee. In addition to some terms and titles discussed earlier under occupation-bound terms which can also be used as terms of formality e.g. *sitt* 'Mrs.' *Maʔali* and *Saʔadit* "Excellency", Palestinian speakers make use of other terms of formality that fit into this category. Some of the terms that fit into this category are equivalent in many ways to the English "Mr." and "Mrs." in that they do not imply any specific profession, and while correlated to educational and/or occupational rank, they are not strictly limited to one group. One male term, three female terms and six plural terms for male and female addressees are included.

The first of these terms is the Standard Arabic term *sayyid* which means 'Mr.' This term is used to refer to men in the third person with or without the name added. Unlike 'Mr.,' the term *sayyid* is relatively uncommon as a term of address in natural speech in Palestinian Arabic, and it is not the all-purpose term that "Mr." is. The term *sayyid* occurs with or without the first name added in third person reference. When preceding a first name, the term *sayyid* can be preceded by the definite article *ʔal* 'the.' The female form, *sayyida* 'Mrs.,' also used in third person reference, is rarely used as an address form in natural speech. Each of the term *sayyid* and its female counterpart occurred only once in the data in an official meeting where one of the participants was called ʔ*al sayyid* with the first name added to invite him to deliver a speech. The female form *ʔal sayyida* with the first name added occurred in the data to address a high female employee in one of the organizations to come to the platform and

deliver a speech in a conference. These two forms are much more common in the written form especially in formal correspondences than in spoken language.

Another general term of respect used to address women is the term *sitt* 'Mrs.' which is used as a third person pronoun to refer to an adult woman in natural speech. In addition to its being one of the main forms used to address female school teachers, the term *sitt* is also used to address government employees and other respectable-looking women who are strangers. Though the term can be used with or without a first name, the seven instances where the term occurred show that the form occurs with first name added if interlocutors know each other and without a name if they are strangers.

Another term that falls under this category is the Standard Arabic term *ʔaanisa* 'Miss' and its borrowed counterpart *Miss*. The form *ʔaanisa* is a term of formality or respect used exclusively to address young females especially in formal settings in meetings and conferences. In natural speech, speakers make more use of other address forms to address young unmarried females. These forms include the first name if they know each other well or the kinship term *ʔuxt 'sister'* if they do not or slightly know each other. However, when used in natural speech, the use of this term is to address a young female is significantly correlated with the speaker's background as a highly educated person. Uneducated and working class speakers, on the other hand, tend to address an unknown young female in the street as *binit* 'girl.' The use of *binit* 'girl' as opposed to the respectable *ʔaanisa* is mainly determined by the speaker's background and level of education. For instance, the data have examples where the term *binit* is used by taxi drivers to ask young females about the place they want to go to and by vendors who try to convince females walking in the street to stop and buy from them. The term *ʔaanisa*, on the other hand, is associated with polite, educated speech and does not have any of the low associations that other forms may have. Only five examples of *ʔaanisa*

appeared in the data involving educated and urban speakers to respectable-looking or young educated unmarried females. If the name is known, it is added. Two examples of *ʔaanisa plus the first name* appeared in the data; one example was used by a boss to address his secretary in a meeting in front of attendants from other organizations. All of these instances of *ʔaanisa* were given from young and older males to young female addressees which corresponds with the term function as a term of formality or respect.

The main constraint in choosing the above forms of address is the formality of context as they are mainly used to mark formality and respect. The speaker's background and the repertory and norms of address they employ are also relevant here in addition to the addressee's occupational or educational rank among known interlocutors. None of these forms occurred enough in the data, so only the above observations about their use were presented.

Another important type of these general terms of respect or formality involves the ones used to address the audience of formal speech. These forms are frequent whenever a speaker needs to address their audience directly. In addition to using them in written correspondence, these terms, most of which are given in Standard Arabic, are used frequently in speeches, in addition to introductory sections of television and radio interviews, some T.V programs, news broadcasts and even some sports broadcasts. The most common phrase used to begin any of these events is *asayyidaati wa saadati* 'Ladies and Gentlemen.' This latter phrase is also used to address participants in a meeting as well as the audience of a public speech along with other forms that include *al Hudoor Al Kareem* 'good attendees or audience,' *Al zumalaaʔ wa al zameelaat al ʔaʕizaaʔ* 'dear male and female colleagues', *ʔayyuhaa l'ixwa wa lʔaxawaat ʔal keraam* 'dear brothers and sisters', etc. In many of speeches, it is interesting to note that these forms are not only used at the beginning of the speech but the speaker may use them at the

beginning of each new paragraph in his speech in order to get the audience's attention, to convey a message of solidarity, and at the same time show respect to them.

In addition to the plurals of several of the terms being discussed, some terms are used by Palestinian speakers as general terms of respect to address a group of addressees in natural speech. A group of people may be addressed with the terms *jamaaʕa* 'group,' *ʔuxwaan* 'brothers', ʔa*xawaat* sisters.' These terms can be used in a formal context, but they also show a degree of solidarity from the part of the speaker with addressees that they together constitute one group. In the present study, for example, these terms occurred frequently in a meeting for teachers who were discussing their demands to improve their occupational status. The term *Jamaaʕa* 'group' occurred several times in the natural data in the familial domain to address groups of friends, brothers, sisters and relatives in addition to its being used to address a group of colleagues at work, for example. However, this latter term is neutral with respect to showing respect.

4.5.7 Age-Related Terms of Address

The natural data show some few examples whose use is mainly determined by the age of addressee. These terms include *haj*, hajje (m. f/ pilgrim), *kbeer* 'older man/ chief,' *mukhtaar* 'chief' for old people and the terms *ʔabu: el shabaab* 'lit. father of youth', *kaptin* 'captain' and *z*aʕ*aeem* 'leader' for young and middle-aged speakers. Except for the term *haj* and hajje which can be used to address male and females, all other forms are only used for men and no counterpart forms exist to address women. This could be due to the fact that men tend to be more innovative in the way they address one another while women and girls tend to be more conservative and traditional sticking to what already exist in the community.

The most frequent of these forms *haj/hajje* with the form *haj* used to male speakers and *hajje* to female speakers. These two terms occurred twenty seven times in the data and are used to address persons who had actually undertaken the pilgrimage to Mecca in addition to its extended use as a mark of respect to any older respected person in general. The most significant variable for the use of these terms is the addressee's age. Similar to what Parkinson (1985) noted about Egyptian Arabic, a possible explanation for why these two terms are associated with older addressees is that in Palestinian community, people are generally not financially or otherwise able to make the pilgrimage until they are relatively old. Also male and female addressees are equally likely to be addressed with these terms. The data, however, indicate that male speakers are more likely to use the terms than are female and that middle aged and old speakers are more likely to use it than young. The use of *haj* and *hajja* as address terms is common from all speakers to spouses, parents, relatives, friends, neighbors, colleagues as well as to unknown addresses, old salesmen, customers, etc with no particular constraints except that of age.

In addition, the term *kaptain* 'captain', which is apparently borrowed from English, is one of the terms associated with young men in Palestinian address system. It is mainly used to address young men who play any kind of sport and more specifically to address coaches. The determining factor here is age as it is used to young and middle-aged men. This term occurred three times in the data where it was used by a group of young men to address their friend whose father is a coach. The other two uses were to soccer players. Another term that is mainly used by youngsters to address their age mates is the term *'abu al shabaab* 'lit. father of youth' which appeared five times in the data. This term is only used among male young speakers who are close friends to address their age mates and show their in-group solidarity.

4.5.8 Religion-Related Address Terms

Similar to other Moslems, Palestinian speakers also very commonly cry out to *Allah* 'God', Glory and Praise to him, spontaneously and in their prayers. Various terms are used, the most frequent of which include *ya rabb* 'O Lord, *'ya rabbi* 'O my Lord,' ya saatir 'O Protector,' Ya *fattaah ya ʕaliim ya razaaq ya kariim'* 'O Opener, O all-knower, O Provider, O Generous One.' The first, *ya rabb,* is often followed by a wish that the speaker prays for Allah to help him get it. A common example is:

- Ya rabb wafeqni w sahel ʔomoori

  O Lord, may you help me be successful and make things easier to me.

The above terms are only a few of the numerous forms that Moslems can use to address God. As mentioned in Qura'n, *Allah* has ninety nine holy names that worshippers can use to refer to him or to cry out to him using these terms. The choice made by Palestinian speakers from among these names depends on what the person wants to say or pray for.

With respect to addressing interlocutors in face-to-face interaction, Palestinian Arabic address system has a few terms which are used specifically to address Muslims and others to address Christians. As no enough data were collected on Christian-related terms of address, this category is limited to Muslim-related terms. Two of these terms include the terms *haj* and *hajje* 'pilgrim' which are explained earlier. These two terms are used to address Muslims who have actually undertaken the pilgrimage to Mecca and are also extended to older addressees as age-related term of respect. The other terms in this category are mainly used in addressing audience in religious lessons and sermons. Instances of these terms which occurred in the data include ya *ʕibaad Allaah al muʔminnin* 'believing worshippers of God,' *maʕshar ilmuslimiin* 'community of the Muslims', *ʔixwani* wa ʔaxawati *fi Illah* 'my brothers and

sisters in worshipping Allah', *ʔaxi al moslem wa ʔuxti al moselma* "my Moslem brother and Moslem sister' and ʔ*ahebati fii 'illah* 'my loved ones for the sake of Allah' and *ʔahebata alʔimaan* 'lovers of faith' are used commonly in Friday sermons to address the audience of the sermon. The singular *muʔmin* and *muʔmina (f.)* can also be used as a religious form to address any Moslem when talking about religious affairs. For example, these two latter instances appeared in the data to address male and female addressees to urge them to contribute to a fund-raising for charitable deeds.

4.5.9 Neutral Terms of Address

This category of terms which are neutral with regard to the degree of respect includes terms with very basic meaning like 'man,' 'woman,' 'youth,' and 'human being.' The function of most of the terms that are included in this category also interacts with other categories such as terms of solidarity and family terms. These terms are neutral with respect to degree of respect or formality and rather they imply either friendship or joking. The terms that occurred in the data include the term *ya bani ʔadam* 'lit. son of Adam - human being' and the feminine form *bani ʔadma* and the plural *bani ʔadmiin* to address a group of friends, for example. Other address terms referred to earlier in this paper include the English *man* that is used among young educated males and its two Arabic counterparts *zalama* and *rajil* among middle-aged and older male interlocutors. Another term that occurred only twice in the data and used to address a group of people is the word *naas* 'people' which is used to both males and females. The last two terms are *mara* and waliyya 'woman' which are mainly used by uneducated middle-aged or older husbands to address their wives. This address term may also be used between uneducated women who are close friends to address each other. Another plural form is the word *neswaan* 'women' which is used by uneducated rural woman to address a group of other woman with the same background. Though this address term is neutral with respect to its meaning, it still defines these women as one group that shares certain characteristics. While

some of these neutral terms are used to address men and women, there are also some terms used to address boys, girls and youth. The plural *banaat* 'girls' occurred in the data when used to address a group of girls or female students by their teacher, another classmate or a friend. The term also is frequently used by a parent to address their daughters. Other speakers with no special constraints may also use the term to address any group of girls. On the other hand, the term *ʔiwlaad* 'boys' is used almost the same way by a teacher, a friend or a parent to address a group of boys. Another term that is used the same way but to younger men is the term *shabaab* 'young men' which can be used by any speaker to address any group of young men. The address term *Jamaaʕa* 'group' occurred several times in the natural data and addressed to groups of friends, brothers and sisters, and children. These terms are neutral implying neither respect nor disrespect.

4.5.10 Other Forms of Address

Though the address forms categories discussed above discuss most of the address terms that Palestinian speakers draw upon to address each other in Gaza, other less commonly used forms, that not all speakers are familiar with, still exist. Such terms involve descriptive phrases, terms of abuse and other rare friendly and joking terms. The latter category of friendly terms involve terms that are used to fulfill the pragmatic functions of flattery, teasing, fault finding and others. Most of the terms in this category are not used for treating or dealing with a person in serious normal daily-life interaction but they serve a communicative function in a particular situation. These terms are also characterized by their being creative and innovative since they are new forms derived or made up from adjectives and nouns in Palestinian Arabic. Though not enough examples are available from the data to discuss these terms in detail, these terms are mainly used among young males for joking or to mark friendship. Some of the few examples that occurred in the data include metaphorical terms like *nuwara* 'lit. blossom of a flower," *baraka 'lit. blessing'* which are used to address someone

who did a good thing to help someone else or is generally known to be a good person. A third term used by young men to address a friend who is physically strong is *wahsh* 'lit. monster." It is to be noted that most of these innovative address terms are used from male speakers to male addressees.

Also Palestinian speakers make use of terms of abuse which refer to words that imply something usually negative about addressee. These terms can be used both sarcastically or playfully and seriously. Terms of abuse e.g. *hayawaan* 'animal', *ibn el kalb* "son of a dog,' *ghabi* 'stupid', *ʔahbal* 'idiot' are used playfully or sarcastically among youthful peer groups and close friends to mark intimacy and friendship but they are never used to any addressee with whom the speaker had a formal or respectful relationship. The use of abuse terms seriously, on the other hand, expresses anger, annoyance, or disapproval of addressee or their misbehavior. A serious usage of abuse terms is extended to parents and teachers who may use these abusive terms to urge their children or students to behave properly. For example, teachers use terms like *hmaar* 'donkey' that imply stupidity specifically to get their students to work harder and act and perform intelligently. Though male and female speakers give and receive these terms, males are more likely to use them. Also with respect to age, young speakers and addressees are generally much more likely to use and receive abusive terms than their old or middle-aged counterparts. It is common to use an abuse term to an addressee the same age as speaker or younger while usage to an older addressee is very rare and considered rude and insolent. Furthermore, if someone received a term of abuse from an age mate or a brother of the same, it is likely that he would respond using the same term or another of abuse. However, when an older person addresses a much younger speaker using a term of abuse, it is unlikely that the addressee would respond using a term of abuse. With respect to status, these terms of abuse are likely to involve an addressee of speaker's same status with almost no up usages. All of the abuse terms recorded in the data involve terms of abuse to known

addressees, however, in real life a few instances may occur to unknown addressees, in the street, for example, to express real anger. The majority of all abuse usages involve use to friends, neighbors, cousins and other relatives. Many also can be used by teachers to students and by parents to their children. A few instances may also occur to a stranger if this person behaved in an insulting way to the speaker or hurt them in some way or another.

As Parkinson (1985) noted though these other forms of address e.g. friendly and joking terms and terms of abuse may seem peripheral to the term of address system since they don't mark formality or respect, still these address terms "must be considered extremely important in the entire communicative context, because of what they do communicate, and what they allow speakers to do" (p.199).

4.5.11 Zero Address Terms

Similar to speakers of other languages, when a Palestinian speaker is in doubt as to how to address people, they can actually avoid the difficulty by not using any address form. Instead, they may use greetings or attention getters. In addition to using pronominal and verb forms of address, the avoidance of using an address term is the most frequent strategy among strangers .e.g. unknown interlocutors asking for direction in the street. While degree of acquaintanceship is the only significant factor that governs the use of these terms among strangers, the influence of other social variables that may determine the choice of these address forms may not be easily evaluated in these interactions which are usually very short. In communication with strangers in general, the Palestinian address system shows that the variant zero address term achieves the communicative function among unknown participants.

Summary

In this section, I have provided a descriptive analysis of the repertory of address forms system among Palestinian speakers in Gaza. This analysis has drawn the general overall scheme of address terms that Palestinian speakers use to address their interlocutors. I have also

tried to show how the choice of address forms made by Palestinian interlocutors is socially meaningful since it correlates with the social variables of relationship among interlocutors, formality of context and participants' social characteristics of age, gender, education, occupation and spoken dialect. Each category of address forms was discussed individually in detail with focus on what type of constraints significantly governs the choice of these terms. In general, the categories of address terms discussed above show different levels of frequency and use dictated often by social indices such as social status, age, gender, nature of relationship and domains of use in addition to pragmatic and communicative functions to serve. For example, the use of pronominal and verbal forms of address is very significant in interaction between strangers. In such situations where a speaker is in doubt as how to address unknown people, the use of pronouns, verbal forms of address or avoiding the use of address term at all is significant as it helps the speaker avoid the difficulty of using an address term that may not be appropriate. Also the different forms of the second person pronoun used as address forms in Palestinian Arabic exhibit a variation similar to that of Tu/Vous distinction in European languages. This variation shows that power and solidarity considerations as introduced by Brown and Gilman (1960) regulate the use of pronouns as address forms in Palestinian Arabic.

With respect to nominal forms of address, the most frequent terms of address that occurred in the data include address by personal names and kinship terms followed by teknonyms and occupation-related terms. The usage and frequency of each category of these terms of address is significant for understanding address behavior among Palestinian speakers. Also the choice from among these address terms reflects a picture of the social norms that govern the way Palestinian interlocutors view their relationship with the society around them through their use of language as reflected in address terms usage.

A main distinction to be made between these categories of address terms is that some of them operate on what Brown/Gilman called solidarity axis while others are dictated and guided by a power axis though this is not always the case. In other words, some of these terms are mainly used to mark distance, formality and respect. Other terms, on the other hand, mainly mark solidarity and intimacy and at the same time may mark respect. For example, names, the most frequent form of address in the data collected, were found to be mainly used across between intimate interlocutors or down to inferior addressees in terms of age or status. Family terms, the second largest category in terms of the instances it includes, reveal a significant distinctive feature of the Palestinian community. The common and frequent use of kinship terms in Palestinian Arabic shows that Palestinian interlocutors highly value family relations which is notable in the phenomenon of address inversion and fictive or extended use of kinship terms for non-relatives. Moreover, the use of teknonyms to address a parent by the name of their older mainly shows respect to an older person as a human parent. Though teknonyms are mainly a form of respect, they do not express formality or distance similar to job-related terms, for example, but at the same time express the respect that an old parent deserves. On the other hand, the tendency to draw on occupation-related forms of address, titles and terms of formality make it clear that marking formality through address behavior is another significant feature of the Palestinian culture and language in general and address terms system in particular.

One implication of having a large number of address forms available to Palestinian interlocutors and the complex pattern of interaction among factors of age, intimacy, situation, etc., is that a Palestinian speaker is faced with a problem of choice. However, the form chosen to address another person is mainly determined by the relationship between interlocutors, from the expected norm of behavior appropriate to the situation, and from what the speaker wants to emphasize in the relationship with the addressee.

In summary, this variety, with numerous forms of address available, provides Palestinian speakers with an extensive range of terms to address their interlocutors. As the above analysis has shown, the choice of a particular address term is viewed by the speaker to be appropriate in terms of factors of relationship and familiarity with the addressee, family kinship, age, gender, occupational/educational rank, spoken dialect and formality of context. These factors do not only refer to characteristics of the addressee alone or characteristics of the speaker alone but to the properties of the dyad as well.

5. SECTION FIVE: CONCLUSION & IMPLICATIONS

This section concludes the paper by pointing out the important findings and discussing the major implications and limitations of the present study.

The main goal of the present research paper was to explore the repertoire of address terms found in the Palestinian community in Gaza together with the factors that explain their differing uses. The research questions were to examine how address term usage in Palestinian Arabic is influenced by the relationship between interlocutors, the context of the conversation and social variables of gender, age, educational and/or occupational rank, spoken dialect and other characteristics of the speech event participants. Using observation as the main research tool, naturally-occurring examples of address forms were collected in the city of Gaza, Palestine.

The findings of the research indicate that twelve principal categories were specifically found to be fundamental to the way residents of Gaza address one another with first names, kinship terms, teknonyms and occupational terms being the most frequent of all these categories. The study also explored the conditions under which these different categories are used. The factors affecting the use of particular terms were determined and an explanation of the reason for choosing one or the other was provided. With differing levels of frequency and saliency, the use of these terms was dictated by socio-cultural factors such as gender, status, age and relationship

of interactants as well as pragmatic factors. In the use of address forms, Palestinian speakers adapt their language to the diverse sociolinguistic contexts based on factors such as relationship with their interlocutor and the interlocutor's as well as their own social and linguistic background in order to ensure effective and real communication. These findings support the fact that terms of address, like other behavioral routines which are deeply rooted in the socio-cultural context of a society, create "a network of bonds and obligations" (Firth 1937: 11).

In general, the overall examination of address terms provided in this paper gives evidence that Palestinian address terms are age and gender sensitive, relatively formal and culturally and socially loaded. For example, when addressing older people, the speaker chooses an appropriate term that shows the necessary respect that is due to older people in the Palestinian community because of their age. However, speakers tend to address those who are equal in terms of age and rank e.g. friends and peer groups, by first names or a solidary term of address. In addressing persons with whom they are not familiar, Palestinian speakers may simply avoid using a form of address or make use of a nominal or verbal form of address to avoid the difficulty of choosing an appropriate form of address.

In some instances, the choice of address variants was interpreted in terms of its being relational, i.e., derivable from the speaker-addressee relationship. In many other instances, the choice of address variants was correlated with speaker's and addressee's age, regional dialect, sex, education, occupation, etc. Accordingly, one of the main conclusions of this study is that in formulating rules or making generalizations about address behavior in Palestinian Arabic it is important to take into consideration the speaker's characteristics, along with those of the addressee and context. Findings of this study confirm Brown and Ford's claim (1961, p.375) found that address usage "is not predictable from properties of the addressee alone and not predictable from properties of the speaker alone but only from properties of the dyad." As

mentioned earlier, it is normal for one person in Palestinian Arabic to receive many different terms of address from different speakers and sometimes to be addressed differently from the same speakers depending on context. For example, the data show an example of a school principal who was addressed as *Sitt* "Mrs." at school and yet addressed by a teknonym *'um fulaan* 'mother of so and so' by the same person in a family domain. Another significant feature of Palestinian address system as emphasized by the analysis is that it is in the domain of addressee-speaker related features of age, occupation, education, etc and the relationship of addressee to speaker that Brown/Gilman's (1960) axes of power and solidarity are expected to come into play in Palestinian Arabic.

However, though address forms in Palestinian Arabic thus share certain universality with those in other languages like Egyptian Arabic, French, English, German, Italian, Spanish, Persian, Nuer, Yoruba and Hindi, the Palestinian address system still exhibits certain unique features that reflect the Palestinian society's socio-cultural context. For example, unlike American English, it has been found that age supersedes rank in dyadic relationships. This supports Hwang's (1991) claim that while we recognize the universal tendency of address terms to reflect power and solidarity across cultures, we should consider "language specific and culture-particular principles governing the proper usage of address terms" (p.131).

A significant implication of the findings of the present study is that they enable an understanding of the address terms used by Palestinian speakers in Gaza as a way of fostering effective intercultural communication of Palestinian speakers with speakers of other languages. Another implication is that the results of this research help non-native Palestinian Arabic speakers communicate better with native Palestinian speakers. This is essential in light of what Parkinson (1985) noted that "knowledge of the proper use of terms of address is, therefore, as important to the overall success of a communication as knowledge of the conjugation of verbs would be"

(p.225). This function of address terms is significant since the ability to use the address terms properly is as important as any other aspect of linguistic knowledge about another language and failure to use them appropriately is likely to hinder effective communication with interlocutors with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. As Parkinson (1985) notes, terms of address may be peripheral to the syntax of language, but this study proves that they are central to the process of communicating among Palestinian interlocutors. In addition, the above findings point to the need for further research, given that there is no extensive body of literature on address terms in Arabic-speaking settings to review. Further research can be conducted to offer a more complete picture of the extent of the influence of many variables on address term usage to see which factors are more significant under certain conditions.

This study provided a detailed descriptive analysis of address term usage among Palestinian speakers and investigated the factors that correlate with differences in this usage. However, even though the study's findings may help bridge a gap in the literature on address systems in an Arabic-speaking setting, a number of limitations have to be acknowledged. To begin with, though the analysis of this study considered the frequency of the different categories of terms of address, it would be important in future research to conduct a statistical analysis to capture the interrelationships between the independent variables and usage of address terms and to provide statistical analysis of the data in a concise way to see which factors are more statistically significant for the choice of a particular address term under what circumstances. Another question to be considered is to what extent the data gathered represent the entire Gaza speech community. To answer this question accurately, another large scale study needs to be done to see how closely the data can be replicated. However the present data comprise a large number of instances of address terms collected from different parts of Gaza city which involve speakers and addressees of all ages, sexes, spoken dialects, educational and occupational rank, etc which gives a representative picture of address terms usage in Gaza . Also, to guarantee access to data

from different interlocutors, fieldworkers who gathered the data included both male and female workers with different social backgrounds from urban and rural areas. Having an equal number of male and female fieldworkers helped guarantee access to data from both sexes. However, though the data give a complete picture about the usage of certain address term categories e.g. first names, family terms, teknonyms, the data do not show enough examples from other categories e.g. endearment terms, terms of formality, to tell how widespread these terms are among Palestinian speakers.

Besides, with the increasing attention to cross-linguistic influence, it may be worthwhile in the future to examine and compare Arabic and English address terms and their relationship to cross-linguistic influence between the two languages. The findings of such research would help foster cultural communication for American learners of Arabic as well as Arabic learners of English. This is significant in light of the cultural and linguistic differences that exist between the two languages. The results of such a study may also have important implications in discourse and translation from English into Arabic and vice versa.

To sum up, the findings of this sociolinguistic examination of address term usage in Palestinian Arabic help provide a better understanding of address behavior in Palestinian Arabic. These findings indicate that similar to address usage in other languages and cultures, the Palestinian address system is governed by sociolinguistic rules determining which forms are used in which circumstances (Brown and Ford 1961, p.375; Philipsen and Huspek, 1985, p.94). This descriptive analysis of the address system in Gaza has also emphasized variation in address as the rule depending on context as well as the sociolinguistic background of speakers and characteristics of addressees (Braun, 1988). It has shown that variation in the choice of address forms by Palestinian speakers in Gaza is socially-governed by multiple rules and not only a single standard set of rules. However, generally speaking, address behavior in Gaza is almost always

related to features associated with addressee, speaker and their relationship in addition to context which may play a crucial role in determining which terms are more appropriate for which setting. The results also corroborate Hwang's assertion (1991, p.131) that while we recognize some universals in address terms systems across cultures, "we should not overlook language-specific and culture-particular principles governing the proper usage of address terms."

Bibliography

Adeniran, A. 1990. Yoruba-English code-mixing and code-switching in conversational discourse: Some communicative motivations. Paper presented at the 19th West African Languages Congress, University of Ghana, Legon, 4-6 April 1990.

Afful, Joseph B.A. 2006a. Address terms among university students in Ghana: A case Study. *Journal of Language and Intercultural Communication 6,1:76-91.*

Afful, Joseph B.A. 2006b. Non-kinship Address Terms in Akan: A Sociolinguistic Study of Language Use in Ghana. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* Vol.27, No.4, 2006.

Ayoub, Millicent R. 1962. Bipolarity in Arabic Kinship Terms. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics,* pp. 1100-06. Edited by Horace G. Lunt. The Hague: Mouton.

Bernard, Russel H. 2006. *Research Methods in Anthropology.* Sage Publications.

Bates, Elizabeth, and Benigni, Laura. 1975. Rules of Address in Italy: A Sociological Survey,' *Language in Society.* 4:271-88.

Braun, Friederike. 1988. *Terms of Address*: *Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, G.; and Yule, G. 1989. *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Roger, & Ford, Marguerite. 1961. Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62: 375-85.

Brown, Roger, & Gilman, Albert. 1960. The pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In *Style in Language.* T.A. Sebock (ed.), 253-276. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chandrasekhar, A. 1970. Personal pronouns and pronominal forms in Malayalam. *Anthropological Linguistics* 12, 246-255.

Chaika, E. (1982). *Language: the Social Mirror.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Cintra, L. F.L. 1972. *On Forms of Address in Portuguese.* Lisbon: Horizonte.

Coulmas, Florian. 1979. On the Sociolinguistic Relevance of Routine Formulae. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3:239-66.

Dickey, Eleanor. 1996. *Gr eek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian*. Clarenton Press. Oxford.

Evans- Pritchard, Edward E. (1964). Nuer Modes of Address. In: Hymes, Dell H. (ed.): *Language in Culture and Society.* New York: 221-227.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M. 1972. On sociolinguistic rules: alternation and co-occurrence. In: *Directions in Sociolinguistics.* Ed. J. Gumperz/D. Hymes. New York etc.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston: 213-250.

Fang, H. and Heng, J.H. 1983. Social changes and changing address norms in China, *Language in Society* 12, 495-507.

Fasold, Roger. 1990. *The Sociolinguistics of Language.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Firth, John R. 1937. *The tongues of men.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fitch, Kristine L. 1991. The interplay of linguistic universals and cultural knowledge in personal address: Columbian Madre Terms. *Communication Monographs* 58, 254-272.

Friedrich, Paul. 1966. Structural Implications of Russian Pronominal Usage, in William Bright (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference*, 1964 (The Hague). 214-59.

Hymes, Dell H. 1967. Models of Interaction of Language and Social Setting. *Journal of Social Issues* 23, 2:8-28.

Holmes, Janet. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* London.

Howell, Richard W. 1968. Linguistic Choice and Levels of Social Change. *American Anthropologist*, 70, 553-9.

Husdon, Richard A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics. New York.*

Hwang, Shin Ja J. 1991. Terms of Address in Korean and American Cultures. *Intercultural Communication Studies* 1:2.

Jaworski, Adam. 1982. A Note on the Types of Address Shifts. *Studia Anglica Posnanieniu,* 14: 259-66.

Kridalaksana, Harimurti. 1974. Second Participant in Indonesian Address. *Language Sciences*, 31:17-20.

Kielkiewicz- Janowiak, Angieszka. 1992. *A Socio-Historical Study in Address:* Polish and English. Frankfurt.

Keshavarz, Mohamed Hussein. 2001. The Role of Social Context, Intimacy and Distance in the Choice of Forms of Address. *International Journal of Sociology of Language 148, 5-18*

Koul, Omkar Nath. 1995. Personal Names in Kashmiri. In: Koul, Omkar N. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics: South Asian Perspectives.* New Delhi.

Kendall, M.B. 1981. Toward a semantic approach to terms of address: A critique of deterministic models in sociolinguistics. *Language and Communication* 1, 237-254.

Kramer, C. 1975. Sex-related differences in address systems. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17, 198-210.

Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, William. 1972a. *Sociolinguistic Patterns.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

----------.1972b. Some Principles of Linguistic Methodology. *Language in Society* 1: 97-120.

Lambert, Wallace E. and Tucker Richard G. 1976. *Tu, vous, usted: a social-psychological study of address patterns.* Rowley: Newbury. Laude-Cirtautas, IIse.

Miqdadi, Fathi. 2003. *Complimenting in Jordanian Arabic: A socio-pragmatic analysis*. PHD Dissertation. Ball State University, IN, USA.

Murphy, G.L. 1988. Personal Reference in English. *Language in Society* 17, 317-349

Morford, Janett. 1997. Social indexicality in French pronominal address. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* vol 7:3-37.

Moles, Jerry A. 1974. Decisions and variability: The usage of address terms, pronouns and languages by Quechau-Spanish bilinguals in Peru. *Anthropological Linguistics* 16, 9:442-463.

Manjulakshi, L. 2004. Modes of address in Kannada: A sociolinguistic study of language use in Mysore District. Available at: http://www.languageinindia.com/sep2004/manjulakshitermsofaddress1.html

Muhlhausler, Peter, and Harre, Rom. 1990. *Pronouns and People: The Linguistic Construction of Social and Personal Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mehrorta, Raja Ram. 1981. Non-Kin Forms of Address in Hindi. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 32:121-37.

Martiny, T. 1996. Forms of address in French and Dutch: A Sociolinguistic approach. *Language Sciences* 18 (3-4), 765-775.

Mitchell T.F. 1975. *Principles of Firthian Linguistics.* London: Longman.

Ostor, Akos. 1982. Terms of Address and Hungarian Society. *Language Sciences,* 4:55-69.

Oyetade, Solomon Oluwole. 1995. A Sociolinguistic analysis of address forms in Yoruba. *Language in Society* 24:515-535.

Parkinson, Dilworh. B. 1985. *Constructing the Social Context of Communication*: *Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. New York. Amsterdam.

Paulston, C.B. 1976. Pronouns of Address in Swedish: social class semantics and a changing system. *Language in Society* 5, 359-386.

Philipsen, Gerry, and Huspek, Michael. 1985. A Bibliography of Socio-linguistic Studies of Personal Address. *Anthropological Linguistics,* 27:94-101.

Pride, John B. 1971. *Formal and informal language: An inaugural address.* Wellington.

Scotton, C.M. and Zhu, W. 1983. Tongshi in China: Language change and its conversational consequences. *Language in Society* 12, 477-494.

Sequeira, D.L. 1993. Personal address as negotiated meaning in an American church community. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26, 259-285.

Southworth, Franklin C. 1974. Linguistic Masks for Power: Some Relationships between Semantic and Social Change. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 16:177-91.

Turjoman, Mona. 2005. *Saudi Gender Differences in Greetings and Leave-Takings.* PHD Dissertation, Ball State University, IN, USA.

Trudgill, P. 1983. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society.* Harmondsworh: Penguin.

Wolfson, Nessa. 1983. An empirically based analysis of complimenting in American English. In N.Wolfson & E. Judd (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*, pp. 82-95. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Wolfson, Nessa. 1976. Speech Events and Natural Speech: Some Implications for Sociolinguistic Methodology. *Language in Society* 5:189-209.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Yassin, M. Aziz F. 1977a. Bi-polar Kinship Terms of Address in Kuwaiti Arabic. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 40:297-301.

Yassin, M. Aziz F. 1977b. Kinship Terms in Kuwaiti Arabic. *Anthropological Linguistics* 19:126-32.

Yassin, M. Aziz F. 1978. Personal Names of Address in Kuwaiti Arabic. *Anthropological Linguistics* 20:53-63.

Zhang, Hang. (2002). Bilingual Creativity in Chinese English. Ha jin's in the Pond. *World Englishes* 21, 2:305-315.

6. Appendices

Appendix 1: The Documentation Worksheet in English

Documentation Sheet

1- **The exact term of address used to address the interlocutor/s**

- Pronoun, specify ----------
- Noun, Specify ----------
- Other, specify ----------

2- The exact term of address used by the addressee to address the speaker in return to the address term received

- -Pronoun, specify ----------
- Noun, specify ----------
- Other, specify ----------

3- Linguistic context of the term of address

a. Conversation Opener ( )
b. Within Conversation ( )
c. Conversation closer ( )
d. Other , specify ----------

4- Setting/ Context of Conversation

- Formal ( )
- Informal **( )**
- **Specify setting, ----------**

5- Speaker's Relationship to the addressee

a. - Relatives ( ) - friends ( ) - colleagues ( ) - acquaintances ( ) strangers ( )
Specify blood relation: ----------

6- Information on conversation/interaction event

- Place and time ----------
- Topic of Conversation ----------
- Number of participants ----------

II. <u>Information on Speaker & Addressee</u>

- **Gender**

- **Speaker**	**Addressee**
- Male ( )	- Male ( )
- Female ( )	- Female ( )

- **Age**

- **Speaker**	**- Addressee**
- 7-17 ( )	- 7-17 ( )
- 18-35 ( )	- 18-35 ( )
- 36-55 ( )	- 36-55 ( )
- More than 55 ( )	- More than 55 ( )

- **Dialect Spoken**

- **Speaker**	**- Addressee**
- Urban ( )	- Urban ( )
- rural ( )	- rural ( )
- Standard ( )	- Standard ( )
- Other, specify ----------	- Other, specify ---------

- **Residence/neighborhood**

- **Speaker**	**- Addressee**
- village ( )	- village ( )
- City ( )	- city ( )
- refugee camp ( )	- refugee camp ( )

- **Education**

- **Speake**r:	- **Addressee**
- Uneducated ( )	- Uneducated ( )
- High education ( )	- High education ( )
- other, specify----------	- Other, specify --------

- **Speaker's Occupation**

- Educated &jobless ( )
- Uneducated & jobless ( ),
- Educated & has job ( ), specify ----------
- Uneducated and has a job, specify ----------
- Specify place of work if applicable ----------

- **Addressee's Occupation**

- Educated &jobless ( )
- Uneducated & jobless ( ),
- Educated & has job ( ), specify ----------
- Uneducated and has a job, specify ----------
- Specify place of work if applicable ----------

- **Any other observations by the fieldworker about conversation, setting and interlocutors**

Appendix 2: The Documentation Worksheet in Arabic

ورقة عمل

1. **لقب المخاطبة الذي استخدمه المتحدث لمخاطبة الشخص الآخر المشارك في الحوار**
   - اسم (اسم شخصى, لقب, كنية,إلخ--)، حدد----------
   - ضميرمتصل(الملحق بالفعل نفسه)، حدد----------
   - ضميرمنفصل مثل أنتو إنتي, إنت، إ لخ) حدد----------
   - شيء آخر، حدد----------
2. **لقب المخاطبة الذي استخدمه المخاطب لمخاطبة المتحدث الذي بدأ المخاطبة**
   - اسم (اسم شخصى, لقب, كنية,إلخ--)، حدد----------
   - ضميرمتصل(الملحق بالفعل نفسه)، حدد----------
   - ضميرمنفصل مثل أنتو إنتي, إنت، إ لخ) حدد----------
   - شيء آخر، حدد----------
3. **سياق المحادثة**
   - رسمي ( )
   - غير رسمي ( )
   - حدد السياق/ أو النشاط----------
4. **علاقة المتحدث بالمخاطب**
   - أقارب ( ) حدد صلة القرابة----------
   - أصدقاء
   - زملاء عمل ( )
   - معارف ( )
   - غرباء ( )
5. **معلومات حول المحادثة/ الحوار**
   a. الهكان والوقت----------
   b. موضوع المحادثة----------
   c. عدد المشاركين في المحادثة----------

معلومات حول المتحدثْ والمُخَاطَبْ

الجنس

المُخَاطَبْ	**المتحدِثْ**
ذكر ( )	- ذكر ( )
- أنثى ( )	- أنثى ( )

الفئة العمرية

المُخَاطَبْ	**المتحدِثْ**
- 17-7 ( )	- 17-7 ( )
- 35-18 ( )	- 35-18 ( )
- 55-36 ( )	- 55-36 ( )
- أكثر من 55 ( )	- أكثر من 55 ( )

اللهجة المُتَحدَثَّة

المُخَاطَبْ	**المتحدِثْ**
- حضرية/ مدنية ( )	- حضرية/ مدنية ( )
- ريفية/ قروية ( )	- ريفية/ قروية ( )
- اللهجة الفصحى ( )	- اللهجة الفصحى ( )
- غير ذلك، حدد ----------	- غير ذلك، حدد ----------

مكان السكن/ الإقامة

المُخَاطَبْ	**المتحدِثْ**
قرية ( )	قرية ( )
مدينة ( )	مدينة ( )
مخيم للاجئين ( )	مخيم للاجئين ( )
حدد **مكان السكن**----------	حدد **مكان السكن** -------
لا أعرف ( )	لا أعرف ( )

مستوى التعليم

المُخَاطَبْ	**المتحدِثْ**
- غير متعلم ( )	-غير متعلم ( )
- تعليم عالي/ جامعي ( )	- تعليم عالي/ جامعي ( )
-غير ذلك/ حدد ----------	- غير ذلك/ حدد ---------- -
-لا أعرف ( )	- لا أعرف( )

وظيفة المُخَاطَبْ	**وظيفة المتحدث**
- متعلم ولا يعمل ( )	- متعلم ولا يعمل ( )
- غير متعلم ولا يعمل ( )	- غير متعلم ولا يعمل ( )
- متعلم وله وظيفة، حدد **الوظيفة** --------	- متعلم وله وظيفة، حدد **الوظيفة** ---------
- غير متعلم وله عمل، حدد ----------	- غير متعلم وله عمل، حدد ----------
- حدد مكان العمل إن أمكن ----------	- حدد مكان العمل إن أمكن ----
- لا أعرف ( )	- لا أعرف ( )

أي ملاحظات أخرى من قِبَل الباحث الميداني عن الحوار أو الأطراف المشاركة في الحوار/ المحادثة:-

---
